The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE deep concern for evangelism in all branches of the Christian Church has not yet led to the discovery of any sufficiently effectual method of bringing the treasure of the Gospel to those who are content to live without it. In the present unprecedented 'climate of opinion' are elements of hostility as well as inertia. But perhaps most important of all are the basic assumptions, in which religion has no place, which underlie so much of modern life. During the past century and a half there has been built up a vast system of knowledge of the physical world which has so enormously enriched human life that its development has, until these last days, held out the promise of a kingdom nearer and more self-evident than the kingdom of God. Dr. MacNeile Dixon in his great book, *The Human Situation,* quotes Professor J. B. S. Haldane as saying that if science be permitted to take things in hand no bounds can be set to human progress. Men "will be able to think like Newton, to write like Racine, to paint like the Van Eycks, to compose like Bach. They will be as incapable of hatred as St. Francis." Man's life will be measured by centuries, "and every moment of his life will be lived with the passion of a lover or discoverer." It was assumed that the philosophical foundations of this edifice of knowledge would support the whole weight of the structure of world civilization. And indeed until the end of the first decade of this century it seemed so. Ancient needs of ordinary men and women were met. New needs were created in order to be supplied. And when failures and breakdowns occurred, the remedies were either offered or promised. The growth of knowledge and the exploitation of new sources of wealth brought about political and social revolutions, in which, if there were some losses, great gains fell to the vast majority. The ideas as well as some of the results of the new knowledge, and something of its philosophical basis, spread from the West to the East, and created more disturbances than the impact of Christianity had done.

* * *

IT is beginning to appear, however, that a secular scientific civilization is less secure than it seemed. Not only are some of the results of the new knowledge an embarrassment, but its philosophical basis is being seen to be too limited. The bed is shorter than that

a man can stretch himself on it: and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it. Man is a more complex being than he had seemed. He cannot live by bread alone, or even by bread and jam.

* * *

But the inadequacies of our scientific civilization must be traced to their source. Our evangelism will not succeed merely because the present secularism is failing. It will succeed because the Gospel is true and is made to appear to be true. Harnack once wrote of "gathering apologetical figs from sceptical thistles", and Mr. Bertrand Russell suggests that that is what Christians are doing or would like to do. That is a shrewd thrust, but it does not go very deep. Christianity laid hold upon men's minds and hearts by its own right, in spite of Gibbon. It is not only the best we know or can think up: it is the best that can be known. It is not therefore an impossible task to defend the Gospel by demonstration in life but also by reason as far as reason can carry us, and so challenge secular civilization on its own ground. For we believe what we do believe because we believe it to be true, and for no other reason.

* * *

The interesting and able Preface to *Crockford* in discussing the nature of the Church's response to the challenge of unbelief declares that the studies which occupy University theological faculties, valuable as they are, bear little relation to the need of apologetic today in a society where Christianity is no more than a conventional sentiment. Somehow we must come to grips with the state of opinion revealed in the social survey of Messrs. Rowntree and Lavers. The recent article in this journal by Mr. Glynmor John was further evidence that much of our apologetic is mis-directed because we do not understand 'the people to whom we minister', or ought to be ministering to.

* * *

The task of evangelism is not easy. Unbelievers are as various as believers. But the fact we cannot afford to ignore in any kind of Christian apologetic now is that a sceptical materialistic philosophy has taken the place of the Christian philosophy once held to be the foundation of our civilized life as men and, though never so clearly, as nations. Christians believe this materialism to be unsound not merely because it is failing. We believe it is failing because it is unsound. Christian apologetic is not now the defence of the faith: it is the attack upon materialism, and so must be as vigorous and as informed as the gravity of the issues at stake demand; not attacking science as if it were the enemy, which it is not, but defining a philosophy in which science has its own important place, but where there is also faith. For there is no

knowledge without faith, and there need be no faith without knowledge. This is the task of Christian scholarship, and it is by no means gathering figs of thistles. Indeed the plea is from the scientists themselves, Come over to Macedonia and help us.

* * *

THE President of the British Association, Professor A. V. Hill, devoted his address at the Belfast meetings in September to an impressive statement of 'The Ethical Problems of Modern Science'. Everybody is, of course, aware of the problem of the atom bomb, which has figured in so many resolutions of religious bodies. But nuclear physics presents no graver problems than does bacteriology, or indeed preventive medicine. Nor has war graver problems than peace. The aim of science is to pursue truth in all the aspects that present themselves to mankind, and its accepted duty is to go where it is led. Discovery can be neither halted nor directed. The unknown cannot be 'planned'.

* * *

BUT science, as is widely realized, has already put into man's hands more power than he is wise enough to use. Nor is this power merely destructive. The dilemma is no less real when we consider some of the most humane applications of new knowledge.

"All the impulses of decent humanity, all the dictates of religion, and all the traditions of medicine insist that suffering should be relieved, curable disease cured, preventable disease prevented. The obligation is regarded as unconditional; it is not permitted to argue that the suffering is due to folly, that the children are not wanted, that the patient's family would be happier if he died. All that may be so, but to accept it as a guide to action would lead to a degradation of standards of humanity by which civilization would be permanently and indefinitely poorer."

* * *

WORLD advances in public health and related subjects, he went on, had led to a vast increase in population and so in pressure on food supplies, so that in India, for instance, it would take all the effort of the Government's first five-year plan to restore by 1955-6 the pre-war standards of food and clothing—standards which were miserably poor and which meant that scores of millions existed only just above the famine level. Meanwhile malaria in India took an annual toll of a million lives and tuberculosis of half a million.

* * *

"THE resolute use of insecticides and anti-malarial drugs (Professor Hill continued) could soon reduce the former to a small fraction; tuberculosis is bound to require more effort and a longer term. Nobody would dare to say that steps to combat these diseases, and others such as cholera, to improve rural and industrial health, to

increase the supply of drugs and medical equipment and services, should not be taken on the highest priority. But the consequence must be faced that a further increase of a million people a year would result. Thus science, biological, medical, chemical and engineering, applied for motives of decent humanity entirely beyond reproach, with no objectionable secrecy, has led to a problem of the utmost public gravity which will require all the resources of science, humanity, and statesmanship for its solution."

* * *

PROFESSOR HILL emphasized that it was not a question only of food; if a higher standard of life was to become universal a far greater demand would be made on all natural resources, and one was left wondering how long these could possibly take the strain. There was much discussion of human rights. At what level could these reasonably be pitched? Did they extend to unlimited reproduction, with a consequent obligation on those people who were more careful? These problems had to be faced not only with goodwill and humanity but also with integrity and courage, with no refusal to recognize the compulsion of simple arithmetic.

* * *

THESE are some of the facts and considerations that weigh heavily upon the consciences of men whose work is transforming human life. Science as such has no resolution of the dilemma in which it finds itself. In present circumstances Professor Hill could look for an answer only from the individual conscience of every scientist. But the scientist must look for his answer not as a scientist but as a man. Medicine had after centuries of experience worked out a code of conduct embodied in the Hippocratic oath. But modern science has grown so fast that scientists are groping in perplexity.

Nor ought we to forget that while medicine was working out its code, it had the guidance of a Christian philosophy, which even if it were not always accepted by all medical men provided 'the climate of opinion' in which they worked. In the problems of today such guidance hardly exists, nor will it unless Christian scholars divert some part of their attention to these things.

* * *

"GOD sometimes needs men to make Him known in advance of the Day. Only they must die before the Dawn breaks."

This epigraph of Pater Lippert is set out at the head of a biographical sketch of *Max Josef Metzger, Priest and Martyr,* by Lilian Stevenson (S.P.C.K., pp., 149, 9s. 6d.). Brother Paulus, as he was known to his friends, was beheaded in Brandenburg Prison near Berlin on 17th April, 1944, having been accused before a People's Court of high treason. This little book includes a number of his letters written after his arrest, sixteen poems also written

in prison, and a rather naïve but revealing letter addressed to Pope Pius XII.

He was, as he describes himself, "only a simple parish priest", but his love for his fellow men, his serene spirit and his dauntless courage glow in every line of these messages that are gathered here. "I have offered my life for the peace of the world and the unity of Christ's Church. God has accepted it and I am glad." These farewell words, written after the death sentence, strike the keynote of his life. He wrote to the Pope, "From many personal conversations with persons outside our Church I can say that if the Christians who are now separated from us were to see the readiness of Church leaders to test everything which seemed doubtful to conscience, if they found us ready in true humility and love to listen to the Holy Spirit even when He speaks through a brother in Christ who differs from them in belief (John 3.8), an inward approach would be achieved, which would bridge gulfs of misunderstanding which at present seem impassable. Humility and love can overcome all obstacles."

"I am, thank God, quite calm and happy, so much so that the warder wondered what was up and why I was so cheerful. But God's child has no grounds for sorrow. And I strive to be led by the Spirit of God and so to deserve to be called His child. 'Abba' is my daily prayer. 'Abba'—good Father—and 'Marantha.' . . . . Sing with me from the Diocesan hymnbook, 'In the midst of Life. . . .' and 'Whate'er my God ordains is right.' What comfort there is in these two. . . ."

To what purpose is this waste? It is the question that always rises in our minds when we contemplate the death of the martyrs. There is no answer yet.

* * *

A Baptist minister recently sent us a card to say that he had decided he must give up this *Quarterly* for reasons of economy, but on receiving the current number had decided he could not afford to do so! Earlier in the year a professor of theology, then unknown to us, wrote from Germany to say that the *Congregational Quarterly* was the best journal of its kind that he saw, and an American student about the same time wrote to the same effect. Letters of this kind do not come by every post, nor after every number, but there is evidence that the communication between our writers and readers at home and abroad, and especially in the mission field, is of real value. Our subscription rate has, indeed, been raised, but only because our costs have risen still more. It would be a great help to all who are engaged in the production of the *Quarterly* if the circulation could be increased, if only slightly.

May we ask our readers to maintain their interest in spite of the

increased rate, and if possible to bring in a new subscriber? In nearly every church there are some members who would be glad to be introduced to us, and some who would be glad to see that their minister received a copy. For this we must ask the help of our friends.

Christian apologetic must be maintained at all levels. Scholars are aware of one another's work, but it is essential that there should be channels through which the fruits of research and experience can flow into the general stream of popular discussion. That is one of the chief functions of this journal and others like it.

* * *

WILL a mechanically minded generation appreciate the story of a greatly beloved minister of Memorial Church, Hull, now retired, who with some difficulty was persuaded to have a telephone installed in the manse? It was explained to him that he would be able to speak to people at a distance and others would be able to speak to him to their mutual convenience. The men who had installed and demonstrated the instrument had hardly left the house when the bell rang. He lifted the receiver with a tentative hand, and as instructed spoke, "This is Clegg speaking; who is that?" A distorted voice replied, "This is Moses." For a wild moment he thought that the half of the wonders of the telephone had not been told him. But before he could raise the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch, the voice went on to ask if he was available to officiate at a funeral. Moses was—and is—a much respected firm of undertakers.

* * *

DR. KATHLEEN BLISS has a war time story of a young French refugee girl, who came under her friendly supervision in a workers' hostel somewhere in the Midlands. On Friday evenings they were accustomed to go into the town to make such whoopee as was possible at a cafe and the flicks. One evening there boarded their tram a woman laden with the week's shopping followed by her husband carrying the baby on one arm and holding a toddler with his free hand. The French girl watched them with the greatest interest and sympathy. Then her shrill voice filled the tram, "Oh in England it is so vunderful how ze men bear ze children."

* * *

The Index. It has been our practice hitherto to print the Index separately and make it available on application. We believe it will be more useful as part of the October number.

THE PARTY-LINE IN MODERN THEOLOGY

By Nels F. S. Ferré, D.D.

There are fashions in theology and, more seriously, there are party lines. To judge aright among fashion, party, and truth, therefore, is never easy. I wish that I could assess exactly, for instance, the place in theology of the sociology of knowledge. No one can understand theology at all adequately without being struck hard by its importance. Just as in the study of evolution, functional ecology needs a close hearing in relation to genetics, so the history of theology should be read with reference to ecology, the social environment of faith, without forgetting the power of tradition.

In the interpretation of theology we must also weigh the power of 'charismatic' personalities, like Kierkegaard, Barth, Tillich and Niebuhr. We must consider, too, that fashions in theology flit from one person to another. Already I have lived through a row of such fashions. Behind and through fashions, personalities, traditions, and the sociology of knowledge, God's own truth tries to make itself heard. If we can be sophisticated enough about these facts, while serious about what concerns us ultimately, we should be able to gain some freedom in observing the party-line in modern theology.

First, however, I want to call attention to two preliminary considerations. In the spiritual history of man there are three stages. In the first, the pre-critical, we accept faith naïvely. We do not seriously question what we have been taught and, therefore, faith is not based on personal insight. All faith in external authority is pre-critical. When faith sees, accepts and wrestles with its own difficulties, the critical stage begins. This is marked by pain and conflict. In this stage we tend to become aggressive against the faith of others, hurting inside, or to condescend to those who still have faith, or else to shrivel up at the heart of our convictions. Beyond both the pre-critical and the critical stages, nevertheless, at least for those who find it, there lies the post-critical faith, wherein, having faced and downed our difficulties authentically, we believe seeingly. Today especially we need a post-critical theology. We have lived too long in the critical era. Our task is not merely to overthrow idols, but to answer the question: Where do we go from here?

My second preliminary observation should indicate roughly five stages of pre-critical faith. Although all of them overlap and intertwine, there are such stages, I feel. Jesus constituted the first external authority. He knew, however, that it was needful for the disciples that He be taken away. When Jesus was gone, reliance

was placed primarily on the Spirit. He was to lead the disciples into all truth, but He tended to become a substitute for mature faith. In the face of persecution, heresy and the need for missionary expansion, there developed gradually a strong institutional church, which, to be sure, acknowledged Jesus and the Holy Spirit and used the Holy Scriptures, but actually subsumed them all under its own power to interpret and to administer; whereupon God raised up the Reformers to break the monopoly of this external authority. Protestantism, however, soon fell prey to the Bible as external authority, until God in his mercy sent us history and science to overturn this new basis of pre-critical faith. When the pietist, moreover, then elevated Christian experience to the place of authority, the Holy Spirit raised up psychology to neutralize this new substitute for living faith. At least our analysis can suggest the fact that man's inveterate tendency is to find some basis in external authority for pre-critical faith, and to urge the need for a post-critical faith. My aim in commenting on a vigorous party-line in modern theology is to contribute to that end.

Modern theology is complex. It can be encompassed in no simple formula. Yet through the complexity, one party-line particularly contends, I believe, that it represents the authentic Christian faith. In general mood this aspiring party-line owes much to the personalities of Kierkegaard and Barth. It is also, to a large extent, a reaction against the liberal age in theology. For many young devotees of my acquaintance, however, it is mainly 'the thing to believe'. The party-line cannot, of course, be understood apart from the sociology of knowledge, conditioned by the crisis of our civilization, traditional theology, regnant personalities, and man's longing to get beyond the inadequate old by means of the revolutionary new. Deeper than these causes, too, lies the call to man's conscience of the authentically Christian. How, then, shall I describe and appraise this party-line in modern theology? I shall use three words or phrases, but only to suggest content and a 'climate of opinion'. These three words are existentialism, depravity, and Biblical theology.

By existentialism I mean here three things: the stress on the particular in religion over against the universal; the stress on the decisional-dynamic over against the theoretical-speculative; and the stress on the subjective over against the objective. Naturally, rather than exhausting the word, these three aspects of it only just touch certain points of its meaning.

The stress on the particular, as in Kierkegaard, claims that, contrary to the case in science and philosophy, in religion we can discover no universals. Biblical theology, consequently, discards meaning for events. Christian ethics suspends teleology. An

infinite qualitative distinction between God and man requires a revelation which is absurd to philosophy and offensive to natural man. God's commands are to the individual, offering not rational but riskful choice. Systematics is man's attempt at security through his own understanding, a rebellion against God's revelation as concrete judgment. The theologian who attempts a system tries to be infinite, and is more comic than culpable. Faith operates with existential logic rather than with a universal discourse of meaning.

Existentialism also stresses the decisional as man's relation to God. The decisional is not some liberal assertion to the effect that he who does God's will "shall know of the doctrine" whether it is of God, in the sense that knowledge is pragmatic; but the decisional in existentialism means that decision before God in Jesus Christ is the heart of doctrine. Although akin to many other anti-metaphysical stances of our age, Christian existentialism of the party-line differs in that the stress is not on the freedom of decision as in Sartre, on economic ecology as in Lenin, or on ethical activism as in John Dewey, but doing is itself the terror of eternal decision in answer to God's judgment. The decisional often gets confused with some glib historic generalization that Hebrew thought was dynamic while Greek thought was static, unscholarly as this may be. The heart of existentialism is decisional-dynamic precisely, however, to banish and to destroy the theoretical-speculative in religion.

The third aspect of what I can now isolate in the existential is the subjective. By this is meant passionate spirituality, not merely an 'I' rather than an 'it'. The modern revolt against 'the cult of objectivity' thus owes much to existentialism. Calm weighing is obviously out of place for those who are forced to decide in a crisis. But beyond such meaning, the subjective involves the awfulness of created spirit wrestling with the dark angel. Dread is the depth-anxiety of sin, not as a social or psychological experience, but as guilt before God the eternal judge. Passionate spirituality is, therefore, not intense inwardness in some pietistic sense of heightened consciousness of God. It is, rather, the stripping away of man's endless veils behind which he hides himself and his hate of God until he shrinks in terror; or else finds inexpressible joy within the absurdity of the Gospel.

What I have now said of existentialism are, of course, only pointers to content and attitude. The existentialism of the party-line is mostly a mood which underlies what is currently judged to be correct. Its Bible is Barth's *Römerbrief* which, however, Barth has himself discarded long ago both in content and in attitude. But even after his work on Anselm, neither he nor his followers, to my knowledge, have discovered the Christian key to the distinctiveness of the Christian discourse, both in meaning and in motivation,

which is neither merely faith's new seeing nor liberalism's universal discourse of man as man. As we now appraise the more contentious extreme, admittedly, we must keep in mind both how much Barth himself now differs from Kierkegaard and, I believe, most of his own disciples, and how, nevertheless, his total influence tends to obstruct authentically Christian construction between the level of redemption and creation. How then do I appraise this kind of existentialism?

The first thing to say, of course, is that any appraisal is theoretical, and as such is out of the existential key. It begs the whole question. But if, perchance, truth is existential and more, an appraisal can have both value and validity.

I start with my last point: subjectivity. If spirit is ultimate, if personality is more spirit than reason, if religion as our relation to reality necessarily evokes our deepest passion, subjectivity is truth. If man confronts God inescapably, not only is subjectivity truth but it is man's most urgent concern. In this, existentialism is right. But man's relation to God is not only direct, but also indirect, through nature and history, through creation. Man confronts God, not only directly as spirit, but also indirectly through mind. That he does so is the very meaning of freedom and precisely the reason for creation. Man can decide, repent, grow in grace because of the capacity of reason to stand over against spirit as immediate subjectivity. Man's subjectivity in relation to God is primary but not entire.

Deciding also is basic to knowing. Faith is more a matter of decision than of thinking. Faith also is man's inescapable and primary stance. Faith is inescapable, since actually man must choose constantly what is to be his relation to reality. Faith is also primary, since God as the ultimate cannot, of course, be proved, without logical contradiction, in terms of anything more ultimate. Nor can any ultimate be found within process, I believe, which does not involve ambiguity, the need to decide in advance of full facts and clear seeing. Faith is therefore necessarily man's inescapable and primary stance. Decision, thus, determines our basic stance while our basic stance determines our dominant perspective. Knowledge pre-supposes faith.

But believing as a condition for knowing is, nevertheless, different from believing as the cause of knowing. "I believe in order to know" has a far different meaning from "I believe and therefore I know". Faith, I repeat, is the condition for knowing but not the cause of it. Faith is a means for knowing, but never a substitute for the knowing which is due to the creative and critical work of mind. Faith as the decision of self is metaphysically primary, but reason as reflective and evaluative response is also necessary. Shall we say that metaphysically subjectivity as

decision is primary, but that methodologically objectivity as evaluative reflection plays a necessary role?

This being so, there are universals available to religious knowledge. If these universals become primary, however, we substitute a system for God. Naturally these cannot be fully known by man nor, being personal relations and possibilities for personal relations, can they be metric in nature. Freedom and personal individuation preclude scientific or philosophic universals as invariant predictables. Kierkegaard's rejection of scientific and philosophical theology in this sense stands and will stand, I believe, as long as truth lasts. But without universals as regular patterns and potentials of some sort religious communication becomes impossible. Religious knowledge contains necessarily communicable 'whatness,' not altogether arbitrary, as well as irreducible 'thatness'. All general ideas and ideals are in some sense universals, and the same problem obtains also in philosophy and in all the social sciences. Nor are these universals completely devoid of capacity for internal organization, external communication, rough, general prediction, experiential and practical authentication, and even some intellectual verification in terms of explanatory adequacy.

Ideas in religion should operate within real relations to God and not as substitutes for God. Without religious ideas which are real beyond particular reference there could be no religious communication, no lecturing, no writing, no education as a whole. Without them the Gospel becomes irrelevant to creation as a whole, and especially to education, theoretical or practical. Theology as the discourse of the Church contradicts religious knowledge as exclusively particular. This stress on the particular prevented Kierkegaard from having a doctrine of the Church and has also adversely affected Barth, taken as a whole. But both have rendered the Church immeasurable service in helping to save it from scientific and philosophic rationalism. Religious knowledge, although organically related to them, is of its own kind and should be treated as such. But I do wish that the stress on the particular of the party-line resulted more fully in the need for personal experience, for the power of the Holy Spirit to give assurance, leading, and the joy and peace in believing.

The second main phrase of the party-line in modern theology is depravity. Let us speak of this, too, under three headings: original sin, impotence and judgment. Again all I can do here is merely to suggest a rough direction to content and attitudes. Original sin is not held to be due, of course, to any actual fall by an historic Adam. A few postulate a pre-temporal fall, but most theologians of the party-line accept some experiential explanation.

Strangely, however, some of these writers, when off guard, tend actually to account for man's inability to be righteous in terms of some historic fall, some supposed loss of the image of God which original man possessed. I have never been able to solve this puzzle, except by believing that, beyond the obvious fact that we are born into a sinful world, these theologians accept modern man's history rationally but tumble back into Biblical mythology very soon after they have assured us that they do not believe in a literal Adam six thousand years ago. Depravity due to original sin, moreover, is total in the sense not that man cannot do any good, but that he cannot endow his will with God's love or in any way satisfy God's demands for righteousness within his own moral powers. Man can never be saved in terms of his moral merits.

The second word is impotence. Instead of glorifying man's natural abilities or praising God for His marvel in the creation of man, the party-line sees that man's natural abilities are so distorted by sin that he is constantly thwarted except within the will of God. Particularly this theology is conscious of the impotence of man's goodness and wisdom. The world may shudder at hydrogen bombs. Theological realism sees a constant crisis of man's impotence precisely because his best intentions and plans go awry. Not only is the myth of irrepressible progress, due to science and education with a religion without tears, exploded, but the very suggestion of improvement offends. Obviously, the mood for the most part lies between either extreme, but a radical turn has been taken in the direction of pessimism and despair. Even the Christian mood of hope for creation through God is shuddered off as shallow.

The third word is judgment. The sinner will mock at grace, He wants none of it. He must, therefore, hear judgment. Selfishness understands fear. The Cross as God's judgment is man's central scandal. Actually natural man hates God, but dares not admit doing so even to himself. Rather he scorns and hates the prophets. To be generally well received is to be a false prophet, particularly if the people addressed are religious. Religion is God's worst enemy, being man's false worship which blocks God off from man. The sinner and the good need no 'love potion'. They are already asleep. They need the thunder of a God, "high and lifted up", until they cry, "I am undone".

What shall I then say of this stress? First of all, that my description of it is clumsy and thin. Secondly, that being little wanted it is very much needed. Man's view of himself as naturally good cannot stand the light of God's revelation in Christ, particularly if we see ourselves in the light of it. Sin is too strong and basic a fact of experience not to be taken with all seriousness. "Ye must be born again" were the words of a realist. Thirdly, an easy optimism helped to prevent the people of God from opening themselves to the

regenerative power of grace whereby they could have become the salt of the earth. An easy-going complacency helped to damn the world with war and despair. Fourth, no real repentance can come without full judgment. We sinners must be fully frustrated through fear before we become willing to accept the grace of God for radical newness of life. Instead of complaining about 'the dirge' of the party-line, I am thankful for a deepened understanding of the Gospel.

The danger of this stress, of course, is that it may deny the Christian gospel. Main concern with sin is main concern with man. Sin is no more than freedom an ultimate category. The ascribing of our situation to a 'fall' of human freedom, as the ultimate explanation, is idolatry. It makes human action eternally decisive. Only God's is so. Sin is completely serious, and, apart from man's full repentance in the light of the whole Gospel, there is no salvation ever; but God and not man, grace and not sin, have the final word, whether for life or for thought. Therefore our main stress must be Gospel and our main mood, as Christians, hope and joy. Man's basic relation to God is never as sinner but as a child of His own creation. Therefore man's basic nature, however much sin may now dominate it, is his capacity to see and to respond to God's call. Naturally such capacity is not apart from God's grace, but grace operates in creation as well as in redemption, in the natural man as well as in the spiritual, in the image of God in the sinner as well as in the saint. The image of God, who as a personal Spirit is Agape, is the personal spirit of man, with the capacity for altruism. Such outgoing 'otherness' is also a fact of experience. Sin reigns over such altruism, preventing its fruition, but when the Word is preached with power, man has the capacity of choice to accept the Gospel. He can choose to repent. Man's ability so to choose is due to the work of the Spirit who lights every sinner who comes into the world, plus the co-operative grace of the Holy Spirit, plus the restlessness of man's image of God, his altruism seeking to escape from the empty reflection of God and to find the reality. Not sin, but the image of God as His call, structurally and functionally, is the deepest truth about man.

As to man's impotence, I believe, obviously, that history does not spiral on some human escalator to its satisfying fruition. The Christian answer to history is, rather, the Cross and the Resurrection. The meaning of the Cross in party-line theology, however, is often not Christian. With the Cross is mixed in too much of general despair. The Cross often connotes more sadness than gladness. The Cross is Christian, however, only when seen through the light and joy of the Resurrection. Both liberals and believers in the Resurrection have a happy ending, but the liberal position knows not the depth of the Cross as the necessary means to man's

salvation. Oppositely, both modern despair in general and much party-line theology are pessimistic about human hopes, whereas true worshippers at the Cross know it to be eucharism to God for humanity, now and in the world to come. Party-line theology lacks largely profound joy and peace in believing, the personal experience of sanctification, and an irrepressible abounding in the fruit of the Spirit throughout all areas of human endeavour. Yet by their fruits ye shall know them. Perhaps a lack of stress on personal prayer and experience are at fault, and a lack of intimate identification of the Word with concrete human needs, personal and social.

My third main heading is Biblical theology. I shall comment on this by means of three words: event, over against meaning; total pattern; and contemporaneity. Strong is the party-line assertion that Christian theology must be Biblical theology, which, in turn, is a matter of God's mighty deeds, a matter of concrete events and not of coherent meaning. The Greeks, it is claimed, thought in terms of logic, system, static substance; Biblical thought is a matter of revelation through events, of God's concrete deeds, of the dynamic. Secondly, the interpreter has no right to select certain strands of the Bible as primary, but must see every strand in the light of the whole Bible, interpreting Scripture by Scripture. Third, the Bible is not to be confined to God's past speech but, on the contrary, is His total speech to the world. All understanding of God's mighty deeds even in the present, must be shaped by the primary documents of the Christian faith which are its final authority.

As to the assertion that Biblical theology finds its authority in events rather than in meaning, I do not think that "event" is an altogether fortunate word, on the one hand, nor do I believe, on the other, that "meaning" is an unambiguous expression; but if these expressions are to be used, it is clear that we see no legitimate meaning except through events and for events. The Word in history must become flesh; the λόγος, the καῖρος. History is never the unfolding of mere logical ideas or moral ideals. History develops rather through the interaction of events. In this sense events are, of course, primary. But events mean something. There is no choice apart from meaning. Apart from meaningful alternatives there can be no decision. To be human we must generalize meaning. We must abstract. Only animals, as a whole, have no free ideas.

To be sure, God as Creator, is more than His every Act or Word. Not even God can be confined to present meaning, for He is creative Purpose. The Word is nevertheless necessary, both for choice and for communication on the level of understanding. The sacraments, for instance, may possibly communicate apart from

actual words (although this is not orthodoxy!), but become magic apart from the background of the Word or Meaning. The Word, the meaning, the Logos, had better not be denied by Biblical theologians! Meaning does not have to be a matter of telescopic coherence, like a box fitting into a box and so on. Meaning can be concrete and personal with universal reference and particular individuation. No two leaves, for example, are the same, we think; yet we can speak meaningfully of a leaf in general. No two persons are the same, yet we can communicate what we mean by the word. No two ethical decisions are ever quite the same in history, yet certain common features obtain, making the study of ethics possible, or a relation of law to Gospel. No faith can be other than particularistic, highly personal; yet we can compare notes and learn from one another. This subject goes very deep, but let me speak my mind plainly to the effect that the trend to speak glibly about historical revelation as "event" over against "meaning" is ill advised and destructive. We are all tired of theory divorced from life, of dull and dead doctrines. The way out of our difficulty and weariness, however, is to make certain that a theological system does not become closed and a cover from God. It must not become abstractive as not applying urgently to concrete events, and particularly to actual persons in their concrete needs.

As to the question of total pattern *versus* selective arrangement of the Bible, I believe that this stress is especially dangerous. It is needed and right only in so far as the Bible is used arbitrarily to advance or to fortify a personal point of view. Such selection from the Bible is, of course, both unscholarly and sinful. It is due to personal pride. Otherwise, however, God is known through His highest revelation of Himself even in the Bible. Not average experience or total coherence points to God, but God's revelation in the most exceptional of all lives, the highest love in human history. Not the general pattern of the Bible but the picture of the Christ affords the revelation which is the power of God unto salvation. Christ is the Event of events which means most to all meanings, whether in clarification, judgment, redemption or fulfilment. The exceptional exemplifies most fully God's general purpose, however the world may then relate itself to it. God's Agape is the principle of selection, discrimination, organization, interpretation and proclamation. This revelation of the love of God as enacted through Jesus and the Christian Community is a self-consistent pattern, which severs what is Word from flesh, even in the life and thought of the historic Jesus. Even if we knew Jesus' actual words, they would not constitute the standard of faith, but God Himself, who sent His own Agape-Word to light, to judge and to save the world. This Word is never a principle or a philosophy, but a Person affording us a general pattern for life and thought.

Contemporaneity, moreover, calls for decision. The Word is nigh to us now, in judgment, offering us salvation. This is not to deny that revelation came objectively in past history, but emphatically to deny that God's revelation is ever primarily past. The Christ who is "the same yesterday, today and forever" is always now the living Word, using the Bible, interpreting it through his Spirit, empowering His messengers. This stress I accept, but not the claim that God's total speech to man in the present is finally shaped by the Bible as a closed canon. The Bible, too, is under God's present judgment. Otherwise we land in pre-critical externalism. Nor is all truth after the pattern of the Bible as a whole. The eternal Love who inspired the writing of the Bible is still at work. We are therefore charged not only to question Greek thought-forms but also Hebrew protology, mythology and eschatology. The sin of the scribes and the Pharisees, who always cry "Crucify!" when the authentic Spirit speaks, is to centre God's revelation in the past rather than in the present. Naturally I do not deny that God's love became enacted in a conclusive fullness in Jesus and in the Christian community, and that the record of this revelation is made objective for our guidance in the Bible. What I do deny is that the Biblical thought-forms are sacred, eternal and exhaustive. The Holy Spirit must still guide us into all truth. We need a new Pentecost which involves our waiting for the Holy Spirit to endue us with power from on high until we become enabled to speak in the tongues of our hearers, not merely in terms of their language, but in terms of the understanding of their total lives, of the current thought forms of each new age. I fear that a good deal of theology of the party-line is traditionalistic in spirit.

As a matter of fact some party-line theologians are calling us back to the Bible or back to some founders. This call is particularly dangerous since to a great extent modern trends in philosophy and in the social sciences have frustrated theological advance for those who depended upon them. Biblical theology is thus partly a city of refuge from secular assault rather than the creative nexus from which we can move out to make all thought captive to Christ. As a friend in Oxford proudly announced concerning Biblical theology, "It snaps its fingers at the philosophers." Some of it is actually an infantile frustration returning for warmth and security into the mother's arms. It is pre-critical. We may now be witnessing at Oxford the unwitting beginnings of the rejection of hard-won scholarship in the Biblical fields for the sake of some new-found, sophisticated fundamentalism. What concerns me is that the feel of the party-line in theology is to a real extent ready for such daring conservatism. Not that historical scholarship is sacrosanct! For many years I have been aware of its slender base and irresponsible fads. We perhaps need a radical jolt and a new direction. But the

conservative climate of opinion should not be allowed to produce some new scholasticism, some new pre-critical approach. Apart from a living faith in the Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth we shall surely fail. The Bible can help us or hurt us. We need external strands of objectified truth within history as secondary directives, but at no point may we freeze history and find God's final truth. With regard to God we live basically by faith in the Spirit and not by sight based on the letter. Let this be our creative emphasis on the contemporaneity of Biblical faith, not the shaping of revelation by time-conditioned forms of thought.

God's revelation, I affirm in closing, requires a basic synthesis of the rational and the existential both in life and in thought, of the particular and the universal, of faith and reason, of the Church and the world. I believe that such a synthesis is possible only in terms of a fuller understanding of the nature and work of the Holy Spirit in the Church and of the Spirit of God in the relation between the Church and the world. We need the creative daring of a post-critical faith both to guide the Church and to help the world. The party-line in modern theology has largely begun a good work. We are thankful for it. It is in danger of becoming a new scholasticism. It needs to be cleansed, deepened, expanded and in some real instances redirected. Its constructive task is hardly begun. We all need increasingly to remain open to God's voice, and humble before our fellow men.

THE DIFFICULTY OF UNDERSTANDING THE RUSSIANS[1]

By Christopher Mayhew, M.P.

The divisions between the Communist and non-Communist world and all the ignorance, fear, suspicion and hatred that exist, I think, on both sides of the Iron Curtain—even though not in the same degree, perhaps, on both sides—is a great challenge to all of us, and particularly to those who, like this great Assembly, represent a movement which has fought these evils so hard in so many parts of the world. I want to suggest that most of us understand the Russians less even than we think we do, and that we could do more to understand them, even granted the enormous obstacles that are put in our way. These obstacles are, of course, formidable. What a tragedy it is that scores of millions of Russian people should be ignorant about us, and we, with the best will in the world, can learn so little about them! I saw not long ago that Mr. Malik, speaking in the Soviet Union, stated with pride that in the previous twelve months 4,000 foreigners had visited the Soviet Union. For so vast a country, that figure, compared with the scores of thousands who come and go freely to our own country, is, I think, a terribly sad admission. I wish passionately myself to have greater opportunities of visiting the Soviet Union, where I have been, but a long time ago. It is very difficult. And even with those Russians who do leave their country—diplomats particularly, from whom one might hope to get a glimpse of the true feelings and the true mind of the Russian people and their Government—experience shows it is terribly difficult to get those close and friendly personal contacts which would help both sides so much.

I remember one year going over to a General Assembly at Lake Success in the *Queen Elizabeth*. In that ship there were representatives of dozens of countries attending the General Assembly of the United Nations, and each delegation had its own table in the dining room. As the great ship moved out of port the barriers began to break down between one delegation and another. But, let us say at lunchtime, at the main entrance to the dining-room a small group of persons would appear. They would thread their way, speaking to nobody either to right or left, and disappear through another door into a private dining room. This, of course, was the Soviet delegation! And then at about two o'clock the little group would reappear, again all together—presumably having all eaten the same

[1] An address delivered to the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in May, 1952.

amount!—and they would thread their way back between the tables; and that was all we would see of them for a long time. They would come to large formal parties, but it was terribly difficult to get those vital personal relationships which help so much towards understanding what lies behind what a man is saying to you. With other delegations you would get to know your opposite number, so that when you arrived at Lake Success you would know that he wasn't going to let you down—or that he was going to let you down! At any rate you got his mind. It was all very much more difficult with the Soviet Union representatives.

I remember once, after some weeks of the exercise of all possible diplomacy and charm, I got a Soviet delegate to come out to lunch with me, alone. But that was a great event, and it doesn't happen often. I remember thinking at the time how much he must have enjoyed it; not on account of me, but because it is quite likely that this charming, intelligent and able young man was having with me the first genuinely free conversation about fundamental things that he had ever had in his life. It was good for both of us. But what a tragedy it is that so many obstacles lie in the way of close understanding and familiarity with Russia and Russian people.

Of course there is no secret about what they say. It is all too difficult to avoid the propaganda that comes out from the Soviet Union. It is essentially a Marxist-Leninist message with all the dogmas with which I think most of us are familiar; and in particular the presentation of the Soviet Union as the pillar of peace and progress, threatened by an encircling and hostile capitalist bloc. The important question is, how much do they believe of this themselves? How much is this, as some people say, cynical propaganda designed to increase the power of the Soviet Union, designed to divide the Western nations from each other? And how much are they genuinely afraid? How much do they really believe that they want peace and stand for peace, and that we are the aggressors, that we are those who threaten them? It is very important, if we are going to save peace, that we should decide which is which, because clearly if they do not believe they are threatened, if they are using this propaganda cynically for aggressive purposes, then our answer must be of a certain kind. It will involve an element of power and strength which otherwise, perhaps, in that degree would not be necessary; but if, on the other hand, they believe what they are saying, if their fear of being attacked, though misguided, is genuinely felt, then mere arms and alliances are not going to win the peace for the Western world.

What then is the answer? Many people, I know, in the Western world say firmly that Stalin is a shrewd and realistic man and that he uses this clever propaganda for his own purposes of expansion. There is a great deal of evidence for this point of view. There are

the simple facts of Soviet action since the war—the annexation of 179,000 square miles of Europe, the condoning of North Korea's aggression against South Korea, the destruction of the freedom of half a dozen formerly independent countries in Eastern Europe, the formation of the Cominform, the non-co-operation in the United Nations Organization, and the establishment of the Iron Curtain. All these suggest a plan, a deliberate plan of expansion, of increased power for the Soviet Union. And then to suggest that they do not really believe their propaganda—surely one can believe that more easily when one reflects how undoubtedly able and intelligent these members of the Polit-Bureau are. Nobody who has had, as I have, the opportunity of seeing Molotov conducting negotiations with the best statesmen of the Western world, can fail to respect the keenness of intellect and shrewdness and ability of that man. Are we to believe that he believes what we know to be the nonsense that we see so often in Communist papers, and hear if we listen in to Moscow Radio? And then is it not clear that, whereas they may talk about Marxism and Leninism, whenever in fact the State interests of Russia conflict with the pure theory of Marx-Lenin, it is Russia which comes first, and Marx and Lenin who come second?

For all these reasons a strong case can be made out that the Soviet Union, bent on world power, uses the propaganda of peace, uses the propaganda that she is being threatened, cynically, without believing it. My own view is that that point of view, in that form, is a very dangerous one. Applied to the ordinary people in Communist countries, to the rank and file who are not the rulers, it seems to me certainly untrue. The contacts I have had with ordinary people in Communist countries have convinced me that they themselves are almost wholly sincere in believing these false doctrines. What they are asked to believe is sometimes very plausible. Sometimes a considerable proportion of it is true, and the propaganda techniques today are of such overwhelming power that we ought always to remember how easy it is for error to prevail where a person is isolated from freedom and free discussion.

I had a remarkable personal experience of this a few months ago. It is just possible some of you may have seen a television programme which I was asked to do on Communist propaganda. I thought I would illustrate the point by asking a cameraman to go down to the Borough of Shoreditch and shoot two five-minute films of Shoreditch, the first to make it look as horrible a place as possible, and the second to make it look as nice a place as possible; and I wrote a commentary in which I put all the good true facts about Shoreditch in the one film, and all the bad true facts about Shoreditch in the other film. But then—and this is the point of the story—I showed it to myself, and I am not exaggerating when I say that it was a revelation to me; because we all think, do we not,

that we are impervious to propaganda and to untruths of that magnitude? It was a revelation to me of the power of deliberate propaganda with the modern techniques that we now have available.

So I believe that anyhow the peoples of these countries are sincere believers in their false doctrines. What of the leaders? They have more opportunities for hearing the truth; some of them travel abroad. The first thing to be said is that they have an overwhelming vested interest in maintaining these myths—the myth, for instance, that Russia is the home of progress and is the leader of social and economic progress, is one that plainly helps to consolidate the regime. And the belief that Russia is threatened by external aggression is another myth which helps tremendously, as all dictators know, to consolidate a community within itself. The greater the tensions within a community the greater the urge to believe that it is threatened from outside. I think it is the same with many individuals. Those who are not at peace with themselves are the readiest to believe they are persecuted by others. This is true, I think, of many dictatorships. The rulers of Russia have a strong vested interest in the maintenance of these myths, and that should pre-dispose them to believe them themselves.

Then below the topmost level of leadership all men will have very powerful reasons of fear and ambition for accepting these myths and not questioning them even in their deepest souls; and I think, too, we have to realize that in dictatorships you rely tremendously on the official sources of information. You don't travel abroad; you don't listen in to the British Broadcasting Corporation. There are 200 jamming stations now preventing the British Broadcasting Corporation services from being heard by the Russian people. Then in this way dictators themselves tend to be the victims of their own propaganda, because subordinates, once they have set the line, once they have announced the theory, in fear supply their masters only with the information to support their ideas and prejudices. This is not only a problem for dictators—it is sometimes a problem for powerful leaders of democratic countries. By stating, for instance, that the Soviet Union is threatened by the United States of America, Stalin automatically tends to cut himself off from all facts and opinions which might prove the contrary, because his subordinates lack the integrity and courage (and a great deal is needed) to supply him with this unwelcome evidence. Thus, I believe, in dictatorships, error builds itself up to a degree which it is very hard for those who live in the free atmosphere of the democracies to understand. And I believe it is perfectly possible for able and intelligent people to believe things which are really ridiculous and would be exposed easily after being subjected to free enquiry and discussion. Finally, a reason for supposing that

the Russians may believe the propaganda they preach is that this seems to explain not only all their policies and the success of their policies since the war, in the expansion of Russia, but it also seems to me to explain their mistakes—where because they acted on dogma and not on realities, as in Yugoslavia for instance, they made the most incredible mistakes which they would otherwise have avoided. So I would summarize this by saying that though there may be some cynicism in the leaders of the Soviet Union about the truth of Marxism and Leninism, and about their propaganda, broadly speaking they are themselves believers in what they preach.

If that is so, or if it is partly so, what follows? I think the first thing is that it *is* so, it is a worrying thing. I would much rather that the first hypothesis were right. I would rather they were cynical and had a thoroughly realistic picture of the world as it is today. If they were realists one could approach them and persuade them on logical and rational grounds that the policies of subversion and non-co-operation to which they have been, and still seem to be wedded, are as bad for them as for us and for the world. But if they really believe in our hostility, our inevitable hostility, and in our intentions to attack them—if these emotions are genuine —then it seems to me the dangers of war are so much the greater.

It follows of course that they do not want war. Very few people, I think, seriously suggest that given the choice between peace and war the Russians would choose war. That makes no sense at all. They know perfectly well that even if they won such a war they would lose in the inevitable devastation; because owing to our lead in atomic weapons, for instance, let alone our conventional armaments which, though far inferior to those, are still very considerable, they would lose more if they lost the war than they could possibly hope to gain if they won it. If, as I believe, they are convinced Marxists, they certainly believe there are at work in the world today economic and social forces constantly weakening the so-called capitalist world and constantly at work strengthening the communist world, and thus it must seem to them obvious that they have more to gain by helping on this process of dissolution by cold-war methods, by helping to subvert, divide and weaken, than by risking all in a war in which they would suffer appalling losses. Nevertheless if it is true that they really genuinely fear us, then the dangers of war coming through misunderstanding seem to me to be very greatly increased.

I am inclined to believe that today there is only one thing which will make one country declare war, atomic war, on another—at any rate much the most probable conditions for that are if one side feels certain in its own mind that the other side is going to make war on him at a later and more unfavourable moment. That seems to me to be the possibility which is really capable of provoking war.

The Russians, for instance, bred on the doctrines of the inevitable hostility of the capitalists against them, bred on a doctrine of dialectical materialism which maintains that conflict is the inevitable concomitant of all change in social life and international relations, bred in a Leninist doctrine that says that capitalism, in its death throes, will lash out against the Soviet Union—they must find it quite easy to believe that the Americans are planning war against them, and that therefore it might perhaps be wise in certain circumstances to make the first aggressive move themselves rather than wait and be overwhelmed at some later date.

Let us look now at the organization of the West described by the Soviet Union as encirclement of them. It is not true that the suspicions and fears of Russia have caused the Atlantic Pact, but it was these fears and suspicions which led to actions by the Soviet Union to which the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was a reply. I do not want to put it too strongly. I am not suggesting that fear was the only motive in Russian aggression. I do not believe it; but if that factor exists it is, I am sure, one we cannot overlook. If this is so, what must our policy be in reply? I suggest that it must necessarily be of a twofold kind. First, I agree with Doctor Grubb that we must have a deterrent to deliberate aggression. If the Soviet Government and Soviet people believe, as I am sure they do believe, in the triumph of their ideas and in world revolution, and are not scrupulous about how they seek it, then we must have a plain deterrent to aggression. All their actions and their ideas show that they will spread world Communism where they can do so on the cheap. We have an example in Korea.

Looking back on it now, I find it hard to believe that if we had shown Russia clearly at that time that an act of aggression against South Korea would be met by clear and united resistance by the United Nations, that original act of aggression would not have taken place at all. There are other occasions in the world and other places where the same disastrous misunderstanding might take place—the Soviet Union thinking we are so weak, thinking we have no power, and taking an adventurous step which, had she known the truth, she would not have taken. For that reason and others I believe that the policy of arms and of alliances is inevitable in the world today, and that no Christian should be ashamed of supporting it. But of course if what I have said is true, that is far from enough by itself. On the contrary. By itself it may inflame the very fears, the very suspicions which I have been discussing. It is also essential that we should have patience and imagination, and, above all, insight into the feelings and emotions of the Soviet Government and people. We must show them that we want peace, that we are arming only for peace. We must constantly try to look at every problem through their eyes—

squinting, if need be, with their own squint at world problems. If they will not do the same, if they will not try desperately to understand our point of view, as in fact they do not, then that is all the more reason for us to try to understand them, and not the less reason. We must try to foresee their reactions at every stage in the world situation, because if Korea illustrated the first point—the need for making our intentions clear and the need for strength—Korea also illustrates the need for studying the likely reactions of the Communist countries to our policies.

It illustrates the need for patience, too. You will remember that the second great tragedy of Korea was the intervention of the Chinese, and that, I think, was at least hastened, at least made more likely, by the fact that, flushed with victory from the bridgehead at Pusan, the United Nations' forces advanced swiftly right up to the Chinese frontier without sufficiently studying the likely reactions of the Chinese Communist Government.

Sometimes, of course, you have an act of policy which looks as though it conflicts with both these principles, and one can only judge then *ad hoc* in the light of the circumstances; but I have described what I am sure is the general approach we should have. Finally, at the risk of sounding a crank, I would like to suggest that it is time we began studying the Soviet motivation in a thoroughly organized way. I was always surprised at the Foreign Office to find how many economic experts on the Soviet Union there were, how many diplomatic experts, how many experts in Russian history and so on, but never once did I find anyone—and I tried without success to get one—who had genuinely and expertly tried to study the psychology of the Soviet Union and of the Soviet leaders as a social psychologist. It seems to me one of the things we could do in our country. But of course you need a great deal more than experts. You need a calm mind, you need an absence of prejudice which is terribly hard to maintain today under all the barrage of propaganda and untruths to which all of us are exposed.

Fundamentally I believe it is in the creation of this atmosphere that the individual can play his most constructive part in world affairs. It is frustrating sometimes to think what a long distance there is between our love of peace, our views on the foreign situation, and what actually happens at Lake Success and between governments. Yet there is a causal link. There has never been a time in history when public opinion has played such a large part in the issues of peace and war, and I believe therefore that the creation of an atmosphere of genuine willingness to understand the other man—without becoming sloppy about it, in such a way as not to face the real danger of deliberate aggression—is a task for individual people; and it does seem to me that it is the spirit of Christ which can contribute most in the end to the solution of the problem of peace and war.

THE CHURCHES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS[1]

By Kenneth G. Grubb, C.M.G., LL.D.

This is a complicated and rather anxious subject, and I like to talk about things cosy and things nice. The trouble is that today there are few things cosy and things nice to talk about, but fear and poverty and the shadow of death:—

> The world which seems
> To lie about like a land of dreams,
> So various, so beautiful, so new,
> Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
> Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
> And we are here as on a darkling plain
> Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
> Where ignorant armies clash by night.

No doubt I exaggerate, yet what is certain is this: that if the world is cursed with plagues, it is the world for Christians to get busy in. It is the greatness of the opposition that tests the warrior, and reveals the stuff of which he is made and the beliefs that sustain his soul. We need not *welcome* each rebuff that turns earth's smoothness rough: there is too much friction in the world already. But there is a great deal to be said for facing a tough, upstanding rebuff squarely, and flooring it.

In the good old days, if they ever existed—which I doubt—we used to say that truth always conquers, men always love the highest when they see it, and everything comes right at the end of the day. There is a fundamental rightness in all this: truth and right do conquer at the end of the day. But it is a very long day: the mills of God grind slowly. What is important for us to realize is that in the world of nations the active conquers the passive, the dynamic the static. The active lie defeats the passive truth, the dynamic conviction the static and formalized theology. You may have all the pundits and experts of the Congregational or of all the churches on your side, but unless you have convictions and enthusiasm, you're through.

It only needs a glance around to see the force of this. A little more than thirty years ago Communism was a question of academic interest to most men. A handful of fanatics had seized the empire of the Russians, which anyhow was as rotten as an old tub, and with their horny hands and dirty boots had climbed on to the

[1]An address delivered to the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales in May, 1952.

jewelled throne of the Czars. No one expected it would last. But these men *believed*. Whether their beliefs were right or wrong is, indeed, important, but has little to do with my argument at the moment. Where have these men—and some of the earliest are still with us—got to today? About a third of the population of the world live under the Red Flag or those that fly beside it. In other countries where other flags fly, there are well-organized and sometimes large Communist parties. In spite of our so-called 'policy of containment', he would be a bold man who would guarantee that Communism had reached its final term. The active has triumphed over the passive, the dynamic over the static, with a vengeance.

Now the Christian Churches of the world, if they are capable of acting together, should be well-placed to exercise a real influence on international relations. I will give a few reasons why this should be so; I will then go on to point out some of the tasks which they should be working at; and finally I will say something of how the Churches can organize for the attack.

When people speak of international relations they mean relations between States. They have in mind the meetings of the United Nations, the negotiations between governments, the treaties, the protocols, the despatches, the telegrams, the coming and going of Ambassadors, and the hundred-and-one duties of a Foreign Office or State Department. So long as there are sovereign States in the world, all this will be the stuff of international relations. But alongside it and with an eye to the farther future, the day *after* tomorrow, it is vital to develop relations based upon a freely accepted loyalty different from loyalty even to one's nation and homeland. This is where the Churches come in. It is their duty, both through their official relations and those of individual churchmen, to explore the pattern of the future world society, to try out among themselves the shape of things to come, and to work for a Christian shape. Christians ought to be able to do this more soundly and soberly than other men because they seek to obey God who is above the nations, and to discover and fulfil His law, which is above the conflicting systems which men have worked out for themselves. To give more cohesive form and more real content to this world-wide fellowship of Christians is a contribution of far-reaching significance to better international relations. The World Council of Churches is a good start, and, of course, has a wide significance which hardly belongs to my present subject, but the moment it gets satisfied with itself it will fall down and die like Faust when he was so pleased with the marsh he had drained.

We really ought to pray and work constantly for the unity of the Church, because without it we are terribly handicapped. We

have it on our Lord's authority that men will believe when they see that Christians are at one. And with what force can we beg the nations to stop quarrelling and start cooing if we are divided ourselves? With some force, of course, because the problems of unity between the nations and between the churches are quite different, and not comparable. But once an argument needs too much explaining, the ordinary man will indulge in complaining and the cause will go by default. It comes to this: although the Churches, including as we may hope and pray the Churches the other side of the "curtain", ought to be a powerful unifying influence, yet their witness, through their own fault, is gravely weakened.

In the dawn of history Jacob wrestled with an angel and was conquered. We are not wrestling with the angel of unity, and the time must come when we concede to him the victory and a new sun will rise upon us.

> Come, O Thou Traveller unknown,
> Whom still I feel but cannot see;
> My company before has gone,
> And I am left alone with Thee;
> With Thee alone I mean to stay,
> And wrestle till the break of day.

Meanwhile, you can't refuse to sell a toy just because you're reorganizing your whole shop, and we must look at some of the things which dog the struggle for world order, and see what Christians are thinking and doing about them.

There is, first and foremost, the crucial question of international justice and peace. This is a matter on which Christians are sharply divided. I am not a pacifist myself. I certainly respect them, but I think that they are vocal beyond their numerical or real importance. When I use the phrase 'international justice and peace' instead of 'peace and justice,' which is more usual, I admit that peace is a product of other conditions. You can always have a peace imposed by force and maintained by tyranny. It was a British chieftain, Galgacus, who had the guts to tell the Romans that wherever they went they turned the world into a desert and called it a peace.

I am not going to fall for the propaganda of the World Peace Council. Just now I am getting heaps of photographs from the Far East and reams of testimony, all designed to show that the Americans are engaged in bacteriological warfare. I have even been sent the witness of a former missionary to this effect. But if the evidence is so readily available, why are the offers of the International Red Cross or the World Health Organization to investigate it, not accepted?

What Christians must do is to attack the causes of war by promoting peaceful change and the pursuit of justice. This means

trying to do many different things at the same time. We, as a country are committed to the policy of rearmament. That, at the moment, is necessary. Nevertheless, we must struggle to maintain the attitude of reconciliation, for reconciliation can be as effective a deterrent to war as rearmament. We must, therefore, welcome proposals for disarmament provided they are subject to the most careful sorting and testing. Again, disappointed as many of us may be in the United Nations, we must give it all the support we can. It is the only international body of this kind we have, and if it did not exist, it would have to be created. It is about the only place in the world where some kind of talking contact can be maintained with the Russians, and it is better to let off steam than explosives. But we ought to go further, and work for a real international police force under the United Nations. Without the prior existence of an international combined force strong enough to safeguard any State against, at least, some measure of aggression, I doubt if you will ever get any effective scheme of disarmament adopted. For we live in a world of fear, not of love or of a sound mind.

I do not believe in any peace at any price: that is appeasement. I believe there is a price that must be paid for peace. I sometimes wonder if we are ready to pay it. It may mean sacrifices which we are little prepared to make. I doubt if those who clamour for peace realize what the price may be. I fancy that it might mean the sacrifice of some of our best cherished attitudes and possessions. Is it too much to expect that Christians will give a lead?

Chief among the causes of unrest and suspicion are the tyrannies that deny freedom to man. The Churches cannot rest content so long as religious liberty is placed under constraint and men are not free to worship God according to their conscience. Nor do I need to point out to Congregationalists that there is an enormous difference between tolerance and freedom. Therefore the Church must work and pray ceaselessly for those who are persecuted because of their religious convictions. Over a vast part of the world men are not free to express publicly their fundamental beliefs. They are imprisoned by a system of power which removes a world of obstacles by the mere decision that it will have none except those of brute force and matter. The best available evidence shows, after the most careful scrutiny, that there are between seven and twelve million persons in forced labour camps in Russia alone. And no one who has read anything of the horrible procedure of accusation by which people in China are denounced to the authorities can have any doubt as to the evil which has been let loose in that land.

It is our convictions about man and the State that are at stake.

Communism, or indeed tyranny of any colour, has no respect for man the individual, the person, but only for society, for man in the mass. The position is well put by the police investigator, Ivanov, in Koestler's *Darkness at Noon*:

> "Every year several million people are killed quite pointlessly by epidemics and other natural catastrophes. And should we shrink from sacrificing a few hundred thousand for the most promising experiment in history? Not to mention the legions of those who die of undernourishment and tuberculosis in coal and quicksilver mines, rice fields and cotton plantations. No one takes any notice of them; nobody asks why or what for; but if we shoot a few thousand objectively harmful people, the humanitarians all over the world foam at the mouth. Yes, we liquidated the parasitic part of the peasantry, and let it die of starvation. It was a surgical operation which had to be done once and for all; but in the good old days before the revolution, just as many died in any dry year—only senselessly and pointlessly."

There are men today who hold that the State is under no restraint, and there is no authority above it. It is absolute and supreme. Rights and liberties are granted by it to man, its tool and creature. He does not possess them because he is a rational being and a child of God: such an idea is laughable to any dictator. And the State, having conceded such rights as it condescends to, can as readily take them away, and often does.

May I make a short digression here and say something about a question that puzzles many sincere Christians—I mean what should be our attitude to the Church and fellow-Christians in "Iron Curtain" countries.

We dwell in freedom; they in peril. We, indeed, suffer from unwilling ignorance, but they from false propaganda, which is worse. Therefore, we must be patient and generous in our tolerance: the first, because to strain after more knowledge might bring them new danger; the second, because we dare not, and must not, judge lest we be judged. Rather we must use our imagination to stir our sympathy not only for the clergy, but for the laity who must live and bring up their families in this strange world where the passions of true men are torn between yearning for social justice and the unjust means too often used to attain it.

We may be disappointed that there is not more resistance. But in the early Roman Empire some Christians were martyred; others obeyed the word to be subject to the higher powers to the perilous margin of apostasy. Devotion to Christ draws His servants different ways, and who are we to judge? Some conquer by death, others by patient continuance in well-doing. Let us remember, too, that church leaders have to face the torturing question 'How far

can I go?' with special poignancy. They must rescue and protect all the liberty they can and guard the life of the Church as the pastors of the people, while, at the same time, the responsibility of example rests heavily upon them.

But formal political or religious freedom is not enough. Liberty without bread is freedom to starve. And men are starving for bread today, in spite of our boasted plenty. Populations have increased, soils become exhausted. Never since research has been conducted have the people of India lived on such bare earth as today. We sometimes speak of finding satisfaction in work, but millions would rejoice if they could only stave off starvation through it. We ought to support all realistically planned programmes of development and welfare in our own dependencies, as well as schemes of technical assistance through the United Nations. We can be grateful that the Churches have been active in pressing these policies and they have done what they can themselves, particularly in the immense and poignant task of aid and service to the vast armies of the refugees and the homeless in Europe, the Middle East and India. Hand-in-hand with the call for food goes the rising clamour for better health and education.

Yet I think that there is one note that the Churches must sound. It is the special witness of the Gospel that men do not live by these things alone. The hunger for God, for eternity, is in their hearts and breaks out even after long suppression. A world which is self-sufficient without God, even a world which may secure this ever-expanding standard of living, still stands under the judgment of God. Man's proud triumphs may yet have to hear the word, 'God in whose hands thy breath is and whose are all thy ways, thou hast not glorified'.

There is another source of trouble which is much with us just now. I mean racial discrimination. This is not to be solved by fervid frothings about the equality of man, for what is at stake here is not man's similarities but his dissimilarities. Nor will it be solved by repeating parrot-like that all are one in Christ. The question is bedeviled by emotions—and, if you like, prejudices—which go deep and bite keen. I do not believe that 'black' and 'white' are equivalent to 'right' and 'wrong' in this matter: men of all colours err. But I do have immense sympathy with the leaders of African communities who, in the only continent native to them, are struggling to state their rights and claim the protection they feel to be their due. If I were in their position, with the knowledge of the past and the transactions of the present fresh in my mind, I should nourish a whole battery of suspicions and only divest myself of them with the greatest reluctance.

Surely what Christian men must work for in Africa is the dynamic partnership of a just and workable multi-racial community. In passing, I hope you will note that I do not say 'inter-racial'—a term which is open to some misunderstanding—but multi-racial. This means much thought, sacrificial action and a real attempt to adopt in this tragic situation Christian attitudes and patterns of behaviour—not the least, forbearance, and the simple Christian principle that the strong must help the weak. Indeed, self-interest alone demands this, since Communists will lightly offer what others are reluctant to attempt. There is an immense field of Christian endeavour here, not the least because Africans and others from overseas are moving amongst us here at home much more than formerly. The Churches must work at this together. And let me add this. I do not think that anything is gained by denunciation of the Dutch Reformed Church of South Africa by those outside: protest we may have to, but we must also strive for understanding arising from the common concern of the Christian fellowship. Meanwhile we have special responsibilities of our own as a country and I hope that the resolutions of the British Council of Churches on the issues involved in Central African Federation will be attentively studied.

I think the Churches have made some progress in tackling these many international questions. The two leading co-operative bodies, the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, have combined to form a Commission on International Affairs. This has its offices in New York, London and Geneva. It has undertaken the task of representing the views of the Churches at the United Nations both through informal contacts with delegations, and through representations which it can make by virtue of its consultative status with the Economic and Social Council under which the Commission on Human Rights operates. But it works in many other fields as well, and I think that within the limit of its resources, the interests of the Churches have been competently handled.

But the Commission does not work in the air: it keeps its feet on the ground. Mainly a lay body, it has its own commissioners, including men of considerable standing in the public life of many countries. It has built up a network of local commissions on international affairs, and of correspondents. Thus the Commission is in a position to ascertain what the Churches of the world really feel. It would take me too long to describe the considerable range of matters which it has handled. They include such diverse issues as the status of Jerusalem and that of South-West Africa, the establishment of Peace Observer Commissions, and crucial pro-

visions in the text of the Declaration and Covenant of Human Rights. Its activities are not confined to the United Nations, but it has developed similar relations with several specialized agencies, such as Unesco.

In our country these matters come regularly under the attention of the International Department of the British Council of Churches, which is also the local commission of the wider body. This Department concentrates, naturally, on those matters of significance to international justice and peace which are of primary concern to the British Churches, and to those of the Commonwealth as a whole.

But details about organization never make very exciting news; I am more concerned to stress that, since the War, a serious attempt has been made to provide means whereby Christian principles can be formulated and applied to this difficult—I might almost say intractable—field. The effectiveness of this depends largely on the interest that Christian people themselves take, since resolutions which merely give the mind of a small committee lack weight unless there is a substantial body of agreed opinion behind them.

It is a facile truism to say that these are grave days. What is more to the point is that they are times of baffling perplexity. Men feel paralysed in the presence of massive and impersonal organizations, and under the shadow of war which has yet to be dispelled by the sunlight of fuller and franker understanding. But we must not give way to this creeping and supine paralysis. We must fight it. We have great allies—great spiritual allies, I mean, and of these I place first the willingness of Christians to find and obey the will of God, and realize their unity with one another. It is He who restrains the unruly wills and affections of sinful men, and the hidden ends of all humanity lie in His hands.

UNIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS—SOME HISTORICAL NOTES

By John Marsh, M.A., D.Phil.

It is commonly supposed among Congregationalists that the idea of Church meetings of wider scope than of one church was left to the brilliance of the late eighteenth century to discover, and to the energy of the nineteenth century to develop; actually this same idea occurred to the Apostolic Church in the days of Peter and James and Paul. It was also present to the Brownists or Separatists. Browne himself, though charged from the time of Increase Mather (1670) with being 'a rigid separatist', makes it quite plain in his *True and short Declaration* (1577) that provision should be made for "seeking to other churches to have their help, being better reformed, or to bring them to reformation" should need require. "Synods" he says are "the meetings of sundrie churches which are when the weaker churches seek help of the stronger, for deciding or redressing of matters". In his "Book which sheweth the life and manner of all true Christians" he further says that "a Synod is a joining or partaking of the authority of many churches met together in peace, for redressing and deciding of matters which can not well be otherwise taken up". It is true that Browne and his immediate contemporaries neither thought this through into an ecclesiastical system, nor were forced to do so by the pressure of events: but enough has been said to clear them of the charge of 'rigid independency'. Neal gives us a picture of the kind of synodal activity that went on in the sixteenth century. He says:[1] "The Nonconformist ministers, under the character of curates or lecturers, supplied the defects of these idle drones (the conforming clergy), for a small recompense from the incumbent, and the voluntary contribution of the parish, and by their warm and affectionate preaching gained the hearts of the people and went from house to house visiting their parishioners and instructing their children . . . Thus most of the Puritan ministers remained as yet within the church . . . But they still continued their associations and private assemblies for recovering the discipline of the church to a more primitive standard . . . Some of the ministers of Northampton and Warwickshire, in one of their associated meetings, agreed upon certain rules of discipline in their several parishes; but as soon as they began to practise them, the court took the alarm, and sent letters to the new archbishop

[1] *History of the Puritans*, Vol. 1, pp. 277 ff.

to suppress them. Accordingly Mr. Paget and Mr. Oxenbridge, the two heads of the association, were taken into custody and sent up to London . . . Some time after there was another assembly at Mr. Knewstub's church, at Cockfield in Suffolk, where sixty clergymen of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridgeshire, met together to confer of the Common Prayer-book, and come to some agreement as to what might be tolerated, and what was necessary to be refused. The brethren are to be requested to ordain a distribution of all the churches, according to the rules set down in the synodical discipline, touching classical, provincial, comitial, and assemblies for the whole kingdom. The classes are to be required to keep acts of memorable matters, and to deliver them to the comitial assembly, and from thence to the provincial assembly. They are to deal earnestly with patrons, to present fit men whensoever any church falls void in their classes. The comitial assemblies are to be admonished to make collections for the relief of the poor, and of scholars, but especially for the relief of such ministers as are deprived for not subscribing the articles tendered by the bishops; also for the relief of Scots ministers, and others; and for other profitable and necessary uses. Provincial synods must continually foresee in due time to appoint the keeping of their next provincial synods; and for the sending of chosen persons with certain instructions to the national synod, to be holden whensoever the parliament for the kingdom shall be called, at some certain time every year." Neal continues, "The design of these conclusions was to introduce a reformation into the church without a separation. The chief debate in their assemblies was, how far this or the other conclusion might consist with the peace of the church, and be moulded into a consistency with episcopacy. They ordained no ministers; and though they maintained the choice of the people to be the essential call to the pastoral charge, yet most of them admitted of ordination and induction by the bishop only, as the officer appointed by law, that the minister might be enabled to demand his legal dues from the parish." The synods were held amidst certain 'exercises' to which the laity were admitted. They consisted chiefly of 'prophesyings' in which laymen and ejected and non-conforming ministers often took part. Archbishop Grindal tried to regulate them by certain rules. But the Queen was not content merely to regulate the prophesyings. She was determined to abolish them altogether. So, "having sent for the archbishop, she told him she was informed that the rites and ceremonies of the church were not duly observed in these prophesyings; that persons not lawfully called to be ministers exercised in them; that the assemblies themselves were illegal, not being allowed by public authority; that the laity neglected their secular affairs by repairing to these meetings, which filled their heads with notions, and might occasion disputes and

seditions in the state; that it was good for the church to have but few preachers, three or four in a county being sufficient." This was on 7th May, 1577.

To return to the life of the Separatists. Seven years after Browne wrote, the *True Confession of the Faith of the London-Amsterdam Church* said that local churches are "by all means convenient to have the counsel and help of one another in all needful affairs of the church, as members of one body in the common faith, under Christ their head." Certainly there was alongside this a rigidly independent development; Francis Johnson would have no interference, reproof or counsel from outside. But apart from this short-lived (though intermittently recurring) independency, Congregationalism has, from its beginning, in the words of Dexter, "been distinguishable from Independency by adding to the independent principle of self-completeness under Christ, of the local church, the further principle that, since all local churches belong to the one family of the Lord, they necessarily owe to each other sisterly affection and activity", and this operates in the communion of churches in Synods or Councils or Associations, or County Unions, or National Assemblies.

In America in 1639 Richard Mather wrote "the Consociation of churches into classes and synods we hold to be lawful, and in some cases necessary: as namely, in things that are not peculiar to one church, but common to them all. And likewise, when a church is not able to end any matter which concerns only themselves then they are to seek for counsel and advice from neighbour churches." And how far the State of Massachusetts was prepared to go is clear from a law passed in 1641: "The general court doth not, nor will hereafter, approve of any such companies of men, as shall join in any pretended way of church fellowship, unless they shall acquaint the elders of the neighbour churches where they intend to join, and have their approbation therein." Both church extension and schismatic synagogues are under the proper restraint of the churches.

This view is echoed in the Cambridge Platform (1648) which says that "the churches ought to preserve church communion with one another. This is to consist of (i) prayer and care for one another; (ii) relief by community of gifts temporal and spiritual; (iii) maintaining unity and peace; (iv) seeking and accepting help in divisions and contentions; (v) taking notice in love and faithfulness of the troubles and scandals of another church and administering help; (vi) admonishing one another when need for it.

The Motherland was not far behind, though the political situation was very different. Thus we read in the Yarmouth Church Book that in 1645 "advice was desired by the church at Hapton whether this was a fit and seasonable opportunity (24th

May) for their pastor to administer the Supper in their public meeting place." Yarmouth was slow to reply, and Hapton wrote again on 12th June, when Yarmouth declared "That the business was of public concernment, and that therefore the churches should be advised with." Two years later Hapton asked Yarmouth whether one can admit an Anti-paedo-baptist into membership, or recognize Pulham, as Yarmouth had done! Upon debate the brethren at Yarmouth stated that "it is a business which concerns all the churches; therefore we are first to advise with all the churches therein before we can give in an answer unto it." Again, in 1651-52 Hapton called Mr. Woodall to be their teacher; but Woodbridge at the same time gave him a call to be their Pastor. So the church at Yarmouth was asked to send 'messengers' to meet with those from other churches at Hapton on 28th January. They met, and the Synod or Council decided that Mr. Woodall should go to Woodbridge. Hapton readily agreed. Finally we read in the Yarmouth Book, 29th January, 1656: "The church this day considered the case of Hapton church and advise that those that live near other churches may join with them, and those that live together may with other christians lay a new foundation, provided that they make no long delay of joining or sitting down anew, and Brother John Green is ordered to write them as much."

Another place in which we can see Congregationalism growing is Cheshire. Here in 1646 at the close of the Civil War the despised Independents pleaded for modification of the law establishing Synods. "O what glory would it be to our Lord, king, nation, if we might see the moral doctrine of the prophets and apostles made old England's canon. Then might our ministers have liberty to preach God's word according to the mind of Christ, and our congregations power to exercise ecclesiastical censures within themselves." But Lancashire, very Presbyterian and powerful saw that "Cheshire has miserably become a prey to the sectaries! They have set up already there two or three Independent churches, and are setting up two or three more"!!!

Adam Martindale tells us that in 1653 "in the month of September on the 14th day of that month, there was a meeting of ministers at Wilmslow which passed a resolution to send letters to invite others to meet at Knutsford on 20th October where in due course they agreed "upon a voluntary association of themselves *and their churches,* if it could be done, for mutual advice, and strengthening one another. Into this society I quickly afterward fell, and met with much comfort and assistance. But by this means our work was increased by meeting frequently about classical business, and preaching in turn or lecturing when we so met." He goes on to say that he could join in the classical life of Cheshire though not in that of

Lancashire because the Cheshire association was voluntary of those wishing to advise and assist one another. "Nor did we look upon ourselves as having any pastoral inspection over one another's congregations, but only to be helpful to them in a charitable way." It is important to note that in this classical organization churches were represented by elders, not by appointed delegates, though the elders were chosen to their office subject to the approval of the classes; that the association itself ordained ministers in the county; that rules were agreed upon about the administration of and admittance to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and about the act of excommunication. This scheme worked from 1653 to 1660. Then, of course, it had to stop. But, says Martindale, "we went on sweet and comfortable so long as liberty continued." It is perhaps worth mentioning that even Presbyterian Lancashire followed with a necessarily short-lived experiment in 1659.

Other experiments were made in other counties. Richard Baxter in Worcestershire had drawn together Independent, Presbyterian and episcopally ordained ministers to carry out such church order and discipline as they held in common, and similar associations were founded in Wiltshire, Dorset, Devon, Cumberland and Westmorland, Hampshire and Essex. These met once a month: they dined together; they had prayers with a sermon following; they then conferred about the state of religion in their districts, and gave each other advice about particular cases. In Baxter's own county the brethren would appoint a subject for discussion at each next meeting, with two speakers, one pro and one contra; "and when the respondent and opponent had done their work" says Baxter, "they were pleased to make it my work to determine"!! But unlike Cheshire, these meetings were for ministers only.

At the time of the Savoy Conference, when the distinction between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism was perhaps more conscious than at any other time, we find our fathers in no wise dissenting from the Presbyterian plea for synods as such, but only asking for a certain recognition of their nature. Owen, e.g., says in his Introduction to the Savoy Declaration "We confess that from the first, every, or at least, the generality of our churches, have been, in a manner, like so many ships, though holding forth the same general colours, launched singly, and sailing apart and alone in the vast ocean of these tumultuating times, and they exposed to every wind of doctrine, under no other conduct than the Word and Spirit, and their particular elders and principal brethren without associations amongst ourselves, or so much as holding out common lights to others, whereby to know where we were. But yet, whilst we thus confess, to our own shame, this

neglect, let all acknowledge that God hath ordered it for his high and greater glory, in that his singular care and power should have so watched over each of these, as that all should be found to have steered their course by the same chart, and to have been bound for one and the same port, and that upon this general search now made, that the same holy and blessed truths, of all sorts, which are current and warrantable among all other churches of Christ in the world should be found to be our lading." To prevent the recurrence of this acknowledged omission, they declared in the 26th section of the "Order of Churches", "That, in cases of difficulties or differences, either in point of doctrine or in administrations, wherein either the churches in general are concerned, or any one church, in their peace, union, and edification; or any member or members of any church are injured in, or by, any proceeding in censures not agreeable to truth and order; it is according to the mind of Christ that many churches, holding communion together, do, by their messengers, meet in a synod or council, to consider and give their advice in, or about that matter in difference, to be reported to all the churches concerned. Howbeit, these synods so assembled are not intrusted with any church power, properly so called, or with any jurisdiction over the churches themselves, to exercise any censures, either over any churches or persons, or to impose their determinations on the churches or officers." Further, Jeremiah Burroughes said a short while before his death: "Those in the christian way acknowledge: (i) that they are bound in conscience to give account of their ways to churches about them, or to any others who shall require it; (ii) they acknowledge that Synods of other Ministers and Elders about them are an ordinance of Jesus Christ for the helping the church against error, schism and scandal; (iii) That these Synods may, from the power they have from Christ, admonish men and churches in his name, when they see evils continuing in, or growing upon the church, and their admonitions carry with them the authority of Jesus Christ; (iv) as there shall be cause, they may declare men or churches to be subverters of the faith or otherwise, according to the nature of their offence, to shame them before all the churches about them; (v) they may, by a solemn act in the name of Jesus Christ, refuse any further communion with them till they repent; (vi) they may declare also in the name of Christ, that those erring people or churches are not to be received into fellowship with any of the churches of Christ, nor to have communion with any other in the ordinances of Christ." To all of which he adds, "I do not in these deliver my own judgement, but by what I know of the judgement of all those brethren with whom I have occasion to converse; yea, it has been their judgement and mine for divers years, even then when we never thought to have enjoyed our own land again."

After the accession of William III and the granting of toleration, the Presbyterian and Independent ministers of London drew up certain "Heads of Agreement" on 6th April, 1691, which contain the following articles: 1. We agree that particular churches ought not to walk so distinct and separate from each other as not to have care and tenderness towards one another; but their pastors ought to have frequent meetings together that, by mutual advice, support, encouragement, and brotherly intercourse, they may strengthen the hearts and hands of each other in the ways of the Lord. 2. That none of our particular churches shall be subordinate to one another, each being endued with equality of power from Jesus Christ; and that none of the said particular churches, their officer, or officers, shall exercise any power, or have any superiority over any other church, or their officers. 3. That known members of particular churches, constituted as aforesaid, may have occasional communion with one another in the ordinances of the Gospel—viz., the word, prayer, sacraments, singing psalms, dispensed according to the mind of Christ; unless that church with which they desire communion hath any just exception against them. 4. That we ought not to admit any one to be a member of our respective congregations, that hath joined himself to another, without endeavours of mutual satisfaction of the congregations concerned. 5. That one church ought not to blame the proceedings of another, till it hath heard what that church charged, its elders or messengers, can say in vindication of themselves from any charge of irregular or injurious proceedings. 6. That we are most willing and ready to give an account of our church proceedings to each other when desired, for preventing or removing any offences that may arise among us. Likewise, we shall be ready to give the right hand of fellowship, and walk together according to the Gospel rules of communion of churches." As to Synods, it is said: "(1) We agree, that in order to concord, and in any other weighty and difficult cases, it is needful, and according to the mind of Christ, that a synod be called to consult and advise about such matters. (2) That a synod may consist of smaller or greater numbers as the matter shall require. (3) That particular churches, their respective elders and members, ought to have a reverential regard to the judgment of such synods, and not dissent therefrom, without apparent grounds from the word of God."

Cheshire welcomed these Heads, and acted on them. The organization now set up differed in one important respect from the first Cheshire Union—it was for Ministers only. Otherwise it had much the same authority and function as the former one. It made rules about the admission of members; it considered all cases of projected removals and advised upon them. Consider, e.g. this letter to a Mr. Travers who contemplated the acceptance of a call

to another church:

> Dear Brother,
>
> Your case was this day taken into consideration. The result is we do unanimously desire you (with all tenderness) not to think of removing without a clearer call. It's feared if you should the effects would be so sad upon the congregation that hereafter it may be reflected on with much regret. Pray suspend your thoughts till another meeting when it may be considered and determined. God keep you in the way of duty and make us all cordially willing to serve our dear Master Jesus Christ with constancy and fidelity in the station he hath assigned us. We are yours in our dear Lord.

It is also worthy of note that this kind of treatment was not reserved simply for those churches that were financially dependent, but was given to all alike; the basis of it was theological, not financial. Another interesting experiment was tried: each county had a staff of men who had finished their College training, and were kept for a year as a mobile county ministry; either moving from church to church, week by week, or residing in one place as assistant to other ministers. At the end of the year they could either settle in the county of their probation, or be passed on to other counties by letters missive. This second Cheshire Union lasted from 1691 to 1745, when it broke up, not because of any defect of the machinery or its working, but because of the inroads of Arianism. Southampton, Devon and Cornwall, and the West Riding also had associations based upon the "Heads of Agreement", and by the 18th century we have 'United Ministers' in Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Warwickshire, Rutlandshire, Cumberland and Westmorland. Doddridge, who was examined by the Leicestershire Association, later formed associations in Suffolk (1740) Norfolk and Northamptonshire. Doddridge did not limit such associations in his own mind to members of his own denomination; but he enthusiastically expounded their cause.

It was in the Suffolk Association in 1777 that Thomas Harman first, so far as I have been able to discover, pleaded for regular councils; or, to put it more accurately, was the first systematically to defend what had become a regular practice of that area at that time. Theoretically synods were still 'occasional', some churches being still somewhat apprehensive of holding them at *stated* intervals. Harman writes, having quoted the "Heads of Agreement" on the communion of churches, "Here is nothing of *authoritative* power, in the usual sense of it; and as to *reverential regard*, all must allow the propriety of it: without it such assemblies of Ministers would be of no consequence at all, as to union and concord. Such *occasional* meetings the Congregational churches always acknowledged, always pleaded for. The 26th par. of the ch. concerning Church Order in the Savoy Confession, is a proof of

it; and the private papers of the church at Yarmouth show it was frequently practised in the *earliest* times of these churches in Norfolk and Suffolk. They still continue among us, though not pursued with the zeal that could be wished. Such *stated meetings* (for they are *usually* held twice a year) may appear to some, very possibly less agreeable than those that are *occasional* in the strongest sense of the word. But while such conventions neither claim, nor mean, any authoritative power, but merely reverential regard to counsels given in the gentlest way, it is inconceivable what disadvantage can arise from them. On the other hand, when they are only assembled upon particular *emergencies,* some inconveniences will attend such an arrangement: congregations often will *remain* perplexed and distressed, because they are unwilling to give the trouble to Ministers and messengers *unused* to such journies: in some cases perhaps matters appearing to them hardly interesting enough to call the churches together, though of sufficient consequence to keep them in a state of distress; in other cases perhaps the contending parties not agreeing about the particular Elders or churches to whom to leave the decision of their matters. Both these inconveniences are *very much* obviated by these *stated meetings*. Many of our churches, however, do not seem to be sufficiently apprehensive of the advantage of such *stated* assembling together; and there is reason to be afraid they are drawing apace to an and." His prophecy was not fulfilled, and it is the occasional meeting that has fallen into complete disuse.

So far we have been dealing, by and large, with the problem of order as it arises within the life of the churches, as a problem internal to the life of the Church. It would be foolish to say that none of the associations we have so far discussed was in any way related to the work of church extension or evangelism, but the problem has been dominantly that of the proper life of churches. But under the influence of the Evangelical Revival, there was a great renewal of concern for church-association. The Evangelical revival was the mother of our great Missionary Societies, but it was also the mother of our County Unions, which in their present form largely date back to this time, and find their *raison d'être* in church extension and evangelism. To this end associations were founded at this time in Essex, the West Riding, Warwick, Hampshire, Bedford and Surrey. It was held that unless the churches undertook the evangelization of England it was sheer hypocrisy to send missionaries abroad.

Speedily is became clear that what was true of the counties—that the churches needed to associate together in order to maintain and extend themselves—was true of the country as a whole, and by 1827 there were discussions as to the possibility of a national union of Congregational churches, who were already referred to

as the Congregational 'body'. What were the issues which the contemplation of a national union raised for our fathers? It is difficult to say, for like so many movements that give rise to some form of institutional life, its beginnings are not recorded. There was evidently much talk and discussion among ministers and laymen before the matter was aired in the 'denominational' press. That is the clear statement in the *Congregational Magazine* when the matter is first mentioned. Some objections to the scheme do, however, appear, even in the *Congregational Magazine,* which whole-heartedly backed the plan. There is the dilemma that such a union is either superfluous or unscriptural: superfluous, if it do nothing to restrict the freedom of the churches, unscriptural, if it imposes any restrictions. It is objected also that the notion of a national union is still vague, and that there has been no grappling with the problem whether the union will mean a union of churches, or of select parties of delegates: the former is at once seen to be impossible, and the latter is quite *un*-Congregational, since we cannot delegate powers to any such body of men. Further, it is claimed that no appeal to expediency, such as 'being able to organize or speak as a unity' like the Anglicans, is sufficient ground for deciding on union. Further, it was objected that the proposed union would do no less than turn us into a sect: so far we had been a 'body', a catholic body, a real church; but to become an incorporated Union would be to become a sect with all the distinctive marks of a sect. Finally, it was objected that such a union would have to set itself up as lord over the churches from the start because it would have to formulate some standard, implicit or explicit, of admission to the Union. These considerations did not carry universal conviction. What prevented them? A two-fold answer; and I hold it fair, as I believe it important, to remember that it was a two-fold reply which made the Union possible.

There was first a theological or Scriptural or religious argument. It appears in many forms, by appeal to Scripture, by reference to the fathers—Owen, Goodwin, etc.—by appeal to the practice of early Independents, especially by a seeking of advice from New England. This was often mixed with the second type of argument from, or to, expediency. Many believed profoundly that we were allowed to do only those things that Scripture enjoined: on this basis some held the Union to be permissible, and others that that no such union of churches was so much as hinted at in the New Testament. Others held that though Scripture did not envisage the C.U.E.W. yet its formation was clearly an application of principles of Scripture. Others, again, thought that neither Scripture nor its principles enjoined such union, but that it was justified on grounds of expediency. The word expediency derives from the debates of the time. The Revd. A. Wells, a Secretary

of the Union, explaining the Union to the Autumnal Assembly at Devonport in 1845, said, "Like all other associations of Congregational churches this Union claims no Scriptural authority for its constitution or plans, but avows itself a voluntary and human, yet perfectly legitimate expedient for carrying into effect the great principles of union and co-operation, inherent equally in the nature of man and the religion of Christ". The meeting resolved that the Union was "entirely in harmony with their principles, and well adapted to secure for them extensive co-operation and fellowship with all their advantages of strength, delight, and brotherly love".

Let us look at the professed objects of the Union when it was formed in May, 1831. The resolution to form it states:

1. That it is highly desirable, and important to establish a Union of Congregational churches and ministers throughout England and Wales, founded on a full recognition of their own distinctive principles, namely, the Scriptural right of every separate church to maintain perfect independence in the government and administration of its own particular affairs; and therefore that the Union shall not in any case assume legislative authority, or become a court of appeal.

2. That the Union consist of County and District Associations, together with any Ministers and churches of the Congregational order recognized by an Association.

3. That the following be the objects contemplated in its formation:

i. To promote evangelical religion in connexion with the Congregational denomination.

ii. To cultivate brotherly affection and sincere co-operation in everything relating to the interests of the Associated Churches.

iii. To establish fraternal correspondence with Congregational churches, and other bodies of Christians throughout the world.

iv. To address an annual or occasional letter to the associated churches accompanied with such information as may be deemed necessary.

v. To obtain accurate statistical information relative to the Congregational churches, throughout the kingdom and the world at large.

vi. To inquire into the present methods of collecting funds for the erection of places of worship, and to consider the practicability of introducing any improved plan.

vii. To assist in maintaining and enlarging the civil rights of Protestant Dissenters.

All this was based, of course, entirely upon a voluntary act of association. The further Statement of Faith and Doctrine says:

2. They believe that the New Testament alone contains, either in the form of express statute, or in the example and practice of apostolic men and churches, all the articles of faith necessary to be believed by a Christian, and all the order and discipline requisite for constituting and governing Christian societies; and that human traditions, fathers, and councils, possess no authority over the faith and practice of Christians.

3. They acknowledge Christ as the only Head of the Church, and the officers of each church under him, as ordained to administer his laws impartially to all; and their only appeal, in all questions touching their religious faith and practice, is to the sacred Scriptures.

4. They believe that the New Testament authorizes every Christian Church to elect its own officers, to manage all its own affairs, and to stand independent of, and responsible to, all authority, saving that only of the supreme and divine Head of the church, the Lord Jesus Christ.

9. They believe that the power of a Christian church is purely spiritual, and should in no way be corrupted by union with temporal or civil power.

10. They believe that it is the duty of Christian churches to hold communion with each other, to entertain an enlarged affection for each other, as members of the same body, and to co-operate for the promotion of the Christian cause: but that no church, nor union of churches, has any right or power to interfere with the faith or discipline of any other church, further than to disown and separate from such as, in faith or practice, depart from the gospel of Christ.

I cannot but think that these statements mean a triumph for the arguments of expediency as over against those of Scripture, or religion. This is of course partly understandable: the difficulty in the formation of any union of Congregational churches was bound to lie in convincing individual churches that their rightful integrity would in no wise be lessened. So far the formulae devised in 1881 are unexceptionable. But it is a different matter if we look here for any clear statement of the undoubted responsibility that any church has, or ought to have, for others, which must surely be the positive basis of any association of churches. There is a sense in which Independency is unqualifiedly right. In the local church, properly constituted and properly living in and by the Gospel and the Sacraments and the Discipline of Jesus Christ, *all* the requisite authority and power resides by the gift of Christ; there is no need, and there is no justification, for any appeal to, or oversight by, any 'higher' authority, bishop, or presbytery or king. Where there is *a* church, there is *the* Church, in all its fulness and power. But one human qualification needs to be made: no

church is 'pure'. No community of Christians, no church meeting, can know infallibly what it is that the Spirit has to say to the churches. But if so, how shall deceptions and self-deceptions be remedied? The particular church cannot do this for itself, for it is in itself that the impurity lies. It can only hope for true reformation as it shares in the community of churches in association, just as the individual believer can hope for true personal reformation only as he shares in the community of Christians that is a local church, with its Gospel fellowship and discipline. That such considerations as these were not to the fore in 1831 is perhaps understandable, but at the same time to be regretted. A great deal of time had to be spent on allaying perfectly understandable, and probably real, fears that the new Union might wrongly interfere with the proper autonomy of the local church. The founders of the Union were so anxious to form and build up the union of churches for the extension of Congregationalism that they gave insufficient time to the deep questions about the religious and theological basis of a true union of gospel churches. But there was nevertheless theological achievement. The constitution was so drafted that no presbytery, priest or king could 'lord it' over the assembly; the Union is completely non-Erastian! It was also found possible to avoid the apparent necessity of setting up some standard of entry into the Union by the ingenious expedient (I imply no censure by those words) of constituting the Union from County Unions, even though some had in the process to be themselves reformed, being at the time of the negotiations entirely or predominantly ministerial.

I cannot, from pressure of space, continue—as I should like to do—right through the century of the Union's life. But the membership of the Union is (since 1845) now of County Unions, of churches, and of personal members, and is financial as well as Scriptural and ecclesiastical. That is to say, any church member may 'buy' himself a seat and a vote in the Assembly. That privilege has not been, so far as I know, misused; but in principle it appears to me to be a violation of all true Congregational conceptions of church structures.

There remain some comments.

First, we still live in an unresolved tension between a 'centralized' and a 'decentralized' democracy; between Memorial Hall and the local church. In part this is inevitable, but in part I think it sin. It is inevitable in that any organization must needs exhibit the usual—I use the word in its modern sense—'demonic' features: it does not 'stay put'. Set up a Youth Department, and it is bound to want to do things for the denomination, which many of the local churches will think undesirable or even wrong. Then you get on the one hand a sense of frustration and impatience, and

on the other a cynicism about what is disrespectfully dubbed 'headquarters'. Frustration has, I think, led to some tendencies to act "behind" the Assembly and to make the real court of decision elsewhere. Yet it is of no use expecting the churches to honour the Assembly if all the vital decisions are made elsewhere, and the Assembly is required to be a mere 'yes machine'. We need, in my view, to renounce the Victorian and Liberal-political habit of the public meeting, return to the Scriptural notion of an assembly, and in prayer, fasting and repentance come together with much time in which to consider the spiritual affairs of our churches, so that, like the early County Unions, we might be together advised about our spiritual condition. Such Assemblies might be less crowded than public meetings; Cabinet Ministers might not address them; but we should do the work of the Church of Christ, and be obedient to him who prayed that we might be made one.

Second, we no longer send an 'annual letter' to the churches. Of late the Chairman and/or Secretary of the Union, or some Committee of the Union has written occasional letters to us. Of that I do not complain. But why cannot we do, what the Quakers still do, and what we proposed ourselves to do at the beginning, *viz.*, at the Assembly draft and pass a letter to be sent from the Assembly, and in its name, to all the churches in the Union? That would be the very best way to reconstitute the Assembly as a spiritual power, and to rehabilitate it in the eyes of ministers and laymen alike. This would need the appointment of a special committee of the Assembly to work during its gatherings. They would need to hear the reports of the various departments and the discussions thereon, and to know how it went with our work overseas; but they could thereupon draft a letter to the churches about ourselves and our duties in each yearly situation. Nothing else could surely have such force and insight. Of course, in our modern usages, the Chairman's Address has taken the place of the Annual Letter: but that only shows the measure in which we have fallen from our belief that Christ gives his gifts to the Church—the whole Church. It is easier to hear what Mr. X or the Reverend Y says to us, because we may then legitimately disagree and conveniently put the challenge aside. But what if the churches gathered in a Scriptural assembly were to write a letter to every member church of the Union? We might still put it aside; but we could hardly do so with such callous or cynical reasons.

Third, we began our history as a Congregational Union of England and Wales by the assertion that the Union had, and was meant to have, no power whatsoever. "The Union shall not in any case assume legislative authority, or become a court of appeal". But, in common with all institutions, the Union has had to take and exercise power. That necessity it shares with every institution in

the world, ecclesiastical and secular. The point is not whether it shall have and exercise power or not, but whether the exercise of power is governed by the Gospel or not. It is, after all, fundamental hypocrisy to say 'we have, and intend to have, no power', and then to contrive ingenious means to manoeuvre even a good scheme through. Ministers do that in local church meetings; officials have done it in the Assembly. In order to remedy this we need to re-examine and to restate our conception of the proper status and authority of Assemblies, Union Committees, Union officials, the Council, Moderators, Principals, Professors, Tutors, Chaplains and all! Surely their authority is the same as that of the church meeting, the same as that of any member who offers counsel to another, the same as that of a Minister who exercises discipline in the name of a church, the authority of Christ, of the Gospel, of the Christ and the Gospel to which the Scriptures witness. The formulation of resolutions in our Assemblies, the origination and execution of our schemes, the conduct and the content of our debates, the sending of material or suggestions to the churches must all be based on this and exemplify it. The churches, in John Owen's words, should be able to "weigh (1) the evidences of the presence of Christ in them (synods), from the manner, causes and ends of their assembling, and from their deportment therein. (2) What regard, in their constitutions and determinations, there hath been unto the word of God, and whether in all things it hath had its due pre-eminence. (3) How all their determinations have been educed from its truth and are confirmed by its authority. Without a due exercise of judgment in respect unto these things, none can be obliged by any synodical determination . . . seeing that without them, and on the want of them many assemblies of bishops, which have had the outward appearance and title of synods, our councils have been dens of thieves, robbers, idolaters, managing their synodical affairs with a fury, wrath, horrible craft, according to their interests, unto the ruin of the church."

Power and authority belong to Christ alone. Our Church order, and especially its Synodical order, was devised to help us both to recognize and to accept that authority as the only power binding in the Church. We cannot retreat into isolationism, we must advance in Congregationalism. We shall do that only if we ponder more seriously and enact more courageously, the principles of association of churches which are our gift from God for the health of His whole Church.

BERNARD LORD MANNING: A MEMOIR

By Phyllis L. Woodger[1]

I am very conscious that I am completely unfitted to speak to scholars and theologians on my brother Bernard's work. But I knew Bernard himself as only members of a closely compact family, who have been children together and close friends all their lives, can know one another.

I may say at once that I am very proud of Bernard and admire nearly everything he said and did and was. All the same, I know this sentiment was not universal in his lifetime and probably is not now, for I remember the almost apoplectic fury of letters and protests that sometimes followed his addresses.

I have no idea how much is known about Bernard. It is ten years since he died. Some of you have read Mr. Brittain's *Memoir,* and I will try not to repeat what he says. Apart from that, Bernard is now known largely by his few books and papers—and those published by the Independent Press are, I believe, out of print. It rejoiced the Methodist strain in me to see that Dr. Henry Bett had an article about him in the *Methodist Recorder* recently. There are some other papers which we hope will be published some day, and his *History of the Dissenting Deputies,* unfinished when he died, has now been completed and is in process of publication by the Cambridge University Press. But the papers and sermons give an incomplete idea of the person he was.

In appearance, Bernard had red hair, cut very short, latterly going a little grey and getting a little thin; and he had the projecting lower jaw that we all inherited from our father. The only dog the family ever kept was a fearful mongrel with enough bulldog in him to give him a similar jaw, so we were all very much alike. Our father (George Manning, 1863-1935) was a Congregational minister, and Bernard was educated first at home, because of early delicacy, and then at an ancient county Grammar School in Lincolnshire, from which he won an open scholarship in History to Jesus College, Cambridge. No undergraduate nowadays is ever as poor as Bernard was then. My father's stipend was about £130 a year, without a manse. Bernard's undergraduate rooms were chosen because they were the cheapest in the College—just inside the main gate on the ground floor, facing north. (The Stair has recently been burnt down.) He went to Jesus in 1912 and remained

[1]A paper read to the Birmingham and District Congregational Ministers' Fraternal at Carrs Lane Church on Monday, 7th January, 1952.

there as Scholar, Fellow, Bursar or Senior Tutor until his death when he was nearly forty-nine. Until Bernard was between twelve and thirteen we spent our childhood together in the Manse at Ravenstonedale. My father taught us: or rather, he gave us the books and helped us to teach ourselves.

I think our beautiful Ravenstonedale is incomparable. There my father's first and longest ministry was, and also his last; and there Bernard and my sister went back and made a home again just before the last war. It is a wide valley, as lovely as its name, surrounded by Westmorland hills with clear-cut graceful lines; on the east side blue with distance, on the west green and soft and friendly-looking. My mother always loved to sing "Ye fair green hills of Galilee" for the rather improper reason that it reminded her of Ravenstonedale. Here Bernard got his first impressions of Congregationalism, in a church founded in 1662; in a low, plain chapel set in its own graveyard where he and my parents are now buried; in the simplicity and dignity of my father's services. It was a village church, but not the handful of elderly people that that often suggests. In those days it was full of young people, and full of life, with a warm and ardent atmosphere.

In talking of Bernard I cannot help saying a good deal about those early days. He himself had a great belief in the importance of a life having "roots". And as I think back over his life, I see the influence of his early years at Ravenstonedale all through it.

He could not bear vague religiousness and woolly piousness, and he often had a hard word for those 'men of goodwill' who were going to bring in the Kingdom of God without the help of God. He called himself, you remember, a 'High Churchman'. "I cannot separate my Christianity and my Churchmanship", he told the Archbishop's Commission on the Relations between Church and State. His pupils noted this in their own way, irreverently, in a poem about their elders and betters in the College Magazine. Their comment on him was:

> In temple tin, with holy din,
> Manning doth Hallelujahs raise.

I believe there were two things which focused on the Church in very early life the attention which later was to develop into passionate devotion. These two things came from our home life—the first from my father in particular. He was a man of most devout personal piety. We knew it as soon as we knew anything. My earliest conscious memory of him is of waiting for him to 'finish saying his prayers' before we went together to our Saturday morning task of winding the grandfather clock. The picture of him reading a worn Bible is the one that springs first to my mind.

But it was quite extraordinary how little he talked religion—I mean personal religion—to his family. He was never really comfortable in family prayers; nor was he quite comfortable without them. We used to tease him about that when we were older. In his household religion and the Church were inseparable.

The second thing was that in the Manse at Ravenstonedale, the Church, which meant for us the High Chapel, was the beginning and end of day-to-day existence. I used to think that that would be inevitable in a minister's family, but I have learnt that it is not necessarily so. Of course, in Bernard's early years, there was not the rival interest of school to distract attention. Lessons were done in my father's study: his Bibles, his other books, his sermon preparation, his lists of hymns, his plans for special occasions, his notes about visiting, were always around us. We walked and bicycled all over the Dale with him when he was out visiting. The Church invaded every single activity of childish life. I am sure that Bernard even got his first interest in buildings, from which his College afterwards benefited so much, during one notable summer when 'The Alterations' were done at the Chapel, and he spent every spare minute sitting on the wall of the chapel yard, close by the men rebuilding the schoolroom, or among the sawdust and shavings inside the vestibule while new pews and partitions were fixed. Watching the organ being built, he learnt enough to be able to do small repairs later on.

In his paper on *The Reformation and the Free Churches* he says he received his first and best teaching about Luther and Calvin in the old vestry at Ravenstonedale. I have a letter he sent me that winter, when he was ten: "I go to Bible Class on Monday nights with Daddy and Alice (our maid). We are doing the Reformation. I take notes". As a result of the fascination that the peculiar goings-on of the Roman Church had for him then, our principal game for months was "being Roman Catholics", with an elaborate system of processions, penances and ceremonies, at which Bernard was invariably the Pope. He had not then begun to call the Roman Church 'The Italian Mission'.

Besides his childhood at Ravenstonedale, one of the most important things in Bernard's youth was the illness that left him, not yet fourteen, with only one serviceable lung. He made so little fuss about this at the time, or at any time, that few people knew how ceaselessly he was aware of the handicap. Cold, frosty weather was a fearful trial to him: that meant drawing each breath with deliberate care. He could not walk upstairs without a pause for rest. There were strong winds in which he just couldn't breathe. Yet I only once knew him give way almost to despair, and that was in 1918 when he got the report of tuberculosis in the remaining

lung, and was threatened with sanatoria and possibly banishment from England. He was very soon his practical self again, determined to cure himself in England, and not in a sanatorium. He took his fresh-air cure for a long time in the little porch of my grandfather's farm in Lincolnshire, as conscientiously and strictly as any doctor or nurse could have made him. For weeks and weeks he sat out there, mostly alone (it was too cold for much company), sweetening the dullness with absurdities and Macaulay's *History of England;* and when darkness came he had a bicycle lamp to light his book.

Bernard's health was always an anxiety, but he dealt with it in a characteristic way. He hated people to moan and chatter about inevitable things—"wild with all regret", I can hear him quote scornfully. His activities were terribly narrowed, so he faced up to what he could do, and did it with such zest and enthusiasm that you did not easily realize all he was missing. He did not take stupid risks; and when he was ill, far from being a depressed or even a quiet, patient invalid, he was almost hilarious. You would take his breakfast to his room and find him in his warm blue jacket (he loved everything possible to be blue), and he would greet you with, "It's enough to freeze the devil this morning, isn't it"? or some familiar family quotation; or would complain bitterly that no one knew how he suffered with his cold nose, and then continue, "Did I ever tell you——?" and embark on some Cambridge story. I remember one morning it was: "Do you think when Cowper wrote 'I delivered thee when bound, And, when bleeding, healed thy wound', he meant 'when bound' and 'when bleeding' to refer back to 'I'? (I, when bound, delivered thee, and I, when bleeding, healed thee.) It makes a splendid couple of lines, but the contrast isn't carried on in 'sought thee wandering'." We had to debate the point, and finally reject it while he ate his breakfast.

I do not believe Bernard ever found things dull: maddening, sad, even tragic perhaps, but never dull. It was amazing what interest, amusement, disgust and delight he got from small and ordinary events, commonplace situations, and apparently uninteresting people. He would groan that some tiresome person had been to see him, or he had had to waste hours at a committee or a dinner with boring and stupid people, and then he would produce stories, quote quaint phrases that had pleased him, and recount all sorts of trifles that turned the dull old bores into characters as individual as Traddles, and a Rustat dinner into an entertainment. He got the keenest pleasure from the simplest things. I remember his calling me into the scullery at home one Sunday afternoon when it had all been left spruce and tidy after washing-up, and saying, "Don't you think this is one of the nicest sights in the world? Why

don't artists paint it more often?'' He was the only man I have ever known who would come into a room you had been giving 'a good turn-out' and comment, ''How nice this looks'', instead of the usual ''What in the world have you been doing now?''—or worse, un-noticing silence. (He nevertheless did express his relief that ''Whatever happens to me in life I can never be a married woman''.) Ordinary peaceful comforts were not just comfort to Bernard, they were delight. He liked cats better than dogs not only because of their 'dignified reserve' but because they 'give an air of comfort to the room'.

Allied to this was his deep love of ordinary country sights and scents and sounds—ordinary and, even more important, familiar. That was characteristic of him. He did not yearn to see new sights, grander, more beautiful, strange or impressive. He would rather know in intimate detail the roads and lanes and fields round the places he loved best. What scores of times we walked together over the South Common at Lincoln, up the lanes and fells of Ravenstonedale, round Jesus Close; and he has written about his lonely walks round Caistor when he was a boy. One of his keenest pleasures in the last years was riding, in the early morning during term at Cambridge, and in the vacations round about Marlborough. The changing colour of light on a hillside; searching for well-known landmarks in a wide panorama; the disappearance of a familiar tree on the horizon; the building up or falling down of a piece of grey stone wall; the first spikes of crocuses under the College trees—these were the things that made his walks vivid and satisfying. He always found fresh magic in those words of Cowper:

> I saw the woods and fields at close of day,
> A variegated scene.

He had, of course, to lead a strictly disciplined physical life, and besides that he admired a disciplined mind. He had no patience with people who lacked discipline, particularly if they flaunted their lack of it. Self-conscious whimsicalities or self-pity irritated him. Exuberant emotionalism, fluffy sentimentality, people who considered that the ordinary rules of conduct did not apply to them, called forth scathing comments. He insisted that people must realize that they had to accept the consequences of their actions, and on the other hand that 'if you will the end, you will the means'. He could be quite inexorable when he was seriously disgusted. He believed that if you allow the evil-doer to escape scot free you penalize the good: and if the evil-doer could not be convinced of wrong, he would pursue him with tireless persistence, and did not mind how long it took.

In his taste in literature this feeling for discipline applied.

He read, and liked, a great deal of poetry. During one of his last vacations he decided that he ought to know Browning better, so he set to work and read him through—"no dodging". But the poetry which gave him the greatest satisfaction had restraint, lucidity and balance rather than the more romantic qualities. The sonnet form particularly pleased him. He enjoyed Scott's novels enormously and, perhaps surprisingly, those of P. G. Wodehouse. He and I went back to Ravenstonedale for long summer holidays for some years, and Bernard used to read aloud endlessly to me, as we sheltered from wind and rain under bridges and by stone walls. We shared a passion for *Treasure Island* but he did not appreciate the rest of Stevenson. He considered the Brontës too introspective and feminine; he rejoiced in Fielding; Scott's long poems amused and pleased him. Ruskin and Carlyle provided endless arguments; Thackeray and Jane Austen got full marks. He used to read Dickens to us at home and liked the plots and the odd characters, but the consciously virtuous young women infuriated him. Esther, in *Bleak House,* roused him excessively. "Now, I warn you", he would say, "we are going to have another bout of this intolerable girl", and he would then get through the chapter in an expressionless voice at an astonishing pace.

Discipline showed in the way he ordered his life—deciding what he most wanted to achieve and then using his limited strength and time to the best advantage. For instance, he had not the opportunity, or very great ability, for playing the piano, but he loved hymns; and so he concentrated on playing hymns. He knew a great deal about them and their tunes and it was one of his happiest relaxations at home. That was how he first began to appreciate Handel's music when he was young, "Because", he said, "it was like a lot of the old wriggly Methodist hymn-tunes"—which he always loved and was seldom able to sing in any service since we have all grown so refined.

It was the same with sport, particularly rowing, as Jesus was specially a rowing College. He took enormous pains to know about it, thoroughly and exactly. The most athletic don was never more relied on for interest, support and enthusiasm. He never missed being at Henley to watch the College boats. One of the undergraduates said: "He would often be on the bank when 'courses' were being rowed. Every race day would find him at the finishing post ready to welcome home Jesus I, Head of the River. Rarely has the College seen such kindly enthusiasm or received such paternal and invigorating encouragement".

You cannot know anything about Bernard without knowing his place in his College life. I have it from many Cambridge men that it was unique. When I was living in Cambridge, I used to

be most entertained by the way he entered into the interests of various groups of the current undergraduates. One term there were a lot of Gilbert and Sullivan enthusiasts; another time he hired a piano so that they could have Victorian and Edwardian evenings and sing things like "How dreadful the death of a diver must be" and "The man that broke the bank at Monte Carlo". This is what one of them wrote after his death:

> He was equally at home discussing abstruse points of medieval theology with major Scholars or in chatting about the lighter side of life at a Boat Club party. Bernard was particularly welcome at such gatherings for he could detach himself from his office and just be our friend. This added to the trust we laid in him. He knew when to stand on his dignity with effect, and when not to without loss of discipline . . . Bernard attracted to Jesus, by his own personality, men who were best in learning and sport, and then imparted to them his powerful and immense enthusiasm.

Undergraduates were his speciality—any sort of undergraduate, from the most superior Etonian to the crudest product of a Municipal Secondary School. He had to be a very unpleasant person indeed for Bernard not to find him amusing, charming and pathetic. "You see what I mean? They really are nice, aren't they?" he would say to me, either when some youth like a Greek god had made his graceful exit, or when he himself had ushered out a crimson, stammering freshman. It was the mixture of simplicity and innocence, with seriousness, self-importance, or even plain badness that enchanted him. He would chuckle over a terrible, tough young man, the despair of authority, whom he overheard one evening telephoning in an engaging little boy tone to 'Mummy darling'. He was delighted when two bashful freshmen outstayed his usual bunch of Sunday evening visitors and confessed that they wanted to practise smoking a cigar. Bernard never got enough of that sort of thing. Of course it was not all so cheerful. There were plenty of times when he had to deal with sordid and even tragic situations. "And people talk about the cloistered life of a University don", he would remark.

Bernard's friendliness was like my mother's, a real painstaking interest in people—all sorts of people, the dentist, the postman, the old man out for a walk with his dog, the boy who drove the car he hired from the garage. He got engrossed in their history, their language, their characteristics. I suppose that is partly why they liked him so much. He took pains to discover what was important to the other person and would then treat it seriously and with an unaffected interest, whether it was motor-cycle racing, photography, High Church ritual, a love affair, or the scandalous politics of a small town. He was ready to go to infinite trouble if

you needed help, to sacrifice much-needed strength, time and money. I have known him to be reduced so low financially on a friend's behalf that he hardly knew where to turn for ready cash, and that when he had a pretty good income. And, most valuable of all, he was always ready to think and to help you to think, clearly, about a worry or trouble. The secretary of the Younger Brother's Society that he helped to found at Jesus College wrote to us: "He was the best older brother of us all". But the bicycle boy, too, said, "He was more like a brother than a Master to me".

We of his family like to remember a lot of ridiculous things which made the complete Bernard to us—the way he raged at people who squeezed their tooth-paste tubes at the top, or tied their ties badly, or women who did housework after supper ("Grounds for divorce, I should call it, if I were married"). And his irreverent quotations on all occasions: "No good in creatures may be found", as he fished crawlers out of raspberries or dodged a wasp; "All things wise and wonderful", as he contemplated a rather self-consciously venerable deacon, and "Not many wise" was applied to many a church member. Those who were acquainted with Sir Ralph the Rover when they were children can imagine how disconcerting it was on suddenly encountering some impressive person in the street, to hear Bernard murmur gently, "Great Heavens! It is the Inchcape Rock"!

One or two disconnected things may be worth saying. "Style is the man"; and in speech and writing Bernard's style was Bernard. It is the perfect expression of his clear and witty mind. But it did not come easily. He worked hard when he wrote. He loved words and the correct use of them. Lewis Carroll started it. "Urr, horrible fellow!" he would growl when some broadcaster committed the unforgivable sin with 'shall' and 'will'.

About Bernard and hymns. As a family, I suppose naturally, we were always discussing, and often criticizing, services when we met. Bernard used to say, "Oh well, whatever happens there are always the hymns. He had a tremendous admiration and affection for Barrett's *Hymnal*. If you have read his *Hymns of Wesley and Watts* you will know how he would shudder at things 'feathered, furred and finny', though he was not squeamish about worms. Elegant improvements like 'poured out sighs and tears' made him pour out worse than sighs. How we shall miss his observations on *Congregational Praise*! It was entertaining as well as instructive to go through any hymn-book with his running commentary, and I know he would have been especially glad to see Watts restored, and some of you can imagine what he would say about references to ladybirds or knights winning spurs. "O

happy band of pilgrims'' was especially his hymn: he said he found it difficult to avoid having it at every service he took. He often ended an evening service with ''Thou who hast known the careworn breast'', and in his services he often chose very simple hymns, even—dare I say it?—those with refrains. He used to have the congregation sing ''Tell me the old, old story'', ''Sing a hymn to Jesus'', ''Onward Christian soldiers''.

If you heard or have read Bernard's sermons you must have noticed his continual consciousness of the imminence of death. Like Richard Baxter, he said he spoke, 'a dying man to dying men'. ''Jesus and the Resurrection'' was his perpetual theme. But it was part of his clear thinking and his hatred of cant and platitude that he never belittled the awfulness and horror of death. In the hour when my father was dying after a long and dreadful illness, my sister and I watched him with little room in our hearts just then for anything but thankfulness that relief was coming. But as I looked at Bernard, I knew he was completely aware of the tremendous thing that was happening. He was tasting all the bitterness and mystery of death at that moment.

He was a great talker, but was almost hesitant and diffident except when talking with friends. I have never met anyone with nicer manners, but when he was roused, thoroughly disgusted, or had put up with enough, he could lay about him in the most devastating manner. I was sorry for anyone who made him really angry. He was deferential with elderly people, and seriously polite with the young. He would not have considered himself 'good with children', but I think this courtesy had a good deal to do with their fondness for him. He could not hurt their self-respect, and just as with older people, he would take endless pains for them. I think of one morning, for instance, when I went into the room where he was typing a section of the *History of the Dissenting Deputies* which he was working at in the vacation. My little daughter was standing beside him, with a small finger on the stop key. In the interfering, tactless way of mothers, I said, ''Don't let her bother you, Bernard''. They both looked up, and I can always see the aggrieved look on her face and the reproachful surprise on his, as he said, ''She's helping. She's putting in the stops for me'', and she said, ''I'm helping Uncle Bernard to write his book''. When she was learning to knit, he entranced her by demanding needles and wool for himself, too. He used to come in—''I must get on with my knitting'', and settle down to it as seriously and laboriously as she did. She never forgets either, how often he would try to have her special hymn when he knew she was going to be in the congregation, or how important it appeared to him, as well as to her, that she should help him to post

his twenty to forty daily letters, and the infinitely slow return up the hill while he told her stories.

Of young people he would say, "Catch them young and give them responsibility before they lose their keenness". The second world war, I think, broke his heart. He would have hated that expression, but I cannot think of another. He had seen his own friends and contemporaries go in 1914, and so few came back. Now it was to happen again with another generation, and one that he loved so dearly.

He toiled for his undergraduates unendingly, trying to get round holes for round pegs, trying to keep things going at College as much as possible on the familiar lines they loved. When the Jesus boat went to the head of the river in some wartime race during the African campaign, he said, "Why I'm so glad is for those chaps in Africa". He was always ready when they dashed in for an hour or two of leave. They even sought him out in vacations at Ravenstonedale. And he was always writing, writing, writing letters to them. On the day he died one of the College servants said, "There'll be mourning all round the world when this is known".

Have I made it all seem too easy and pleasant? I would not have you think it was. There were hardships, anxieties, humiliations, trials, griefs and bitter disappointments that it is not for me to talk about. He would not otherwise have been the strength and consolation that he was to sinners, weaklings and the troubled—and that he still is to some of us. About eighteen months before he died he wrote to me: "I do sometimes find it very hard to believe in a good and loving God. At those times all I can do is to hang on to what I know about Jesus. I am sure about that".

I have not attempted to talk about his religious faith. He has spoken for himself. Mr. Brittain ends his *Memoir* by saying: "He championed the faith in season and out of season, in speech and in writing. What he did not know was how greatly he championed the Christian religion by his daily life".

Bernard had "been with Jesus": he was with Jesus, and people who met him took knowledge of it.

Of course, he was not faultless; but he was the nearest to a saint that I have ever known. I shall not look upon his like again.

THE ARGUMENTS FOR GOD'S EXISTENCE

E. L. Allen, Ph.D., D.D.

It is always good when a debate shows signs of drawing to a close because discussion has led the parties to it so to redefine their respective positions that it cannot now be long before they approach agreement for all practical purposes. Something of this kind would seem to be happening where the possibility of demonstrating God's existence is in dispute. The followers of Aquinas have maintained that God's existence can be inferred, in accordance with the famous "Five Ways", from various aspects of the world; the followers of Kant that all such attempts break down and that God is to be found only in conscience, as a postulate of the moral life. But in the course of the debate it has become clear that terms like "demonstration" and "existence" call for closer definition, and that those who claim that it is possible to prove God may mean by proof something not so very different after all from what is in the minds of those who speak of His attestation in conscience. A glance at some recent restatements of the older position will show that this is in fact what has happened.

Thus, for example, E. L. Mascall in *Existence and Analogy* represents a Neo-Thomism that is far indeed from imagining that God can be reached as the conclusion of a syllogism, one premiss of which is derived from the observation of nature, while the other is an *a priori* general principle supplied by our own minds. Existence, we are told, is something much more than the occupation of space and time; it is activity and energy. Further, we do not pass from the objects of the natural world to God by argument, rather do we develop what is implicit in our apprehension of the infinite in the finite. "The primary requirement, if we are to pass from the recognition of the finite to the affirmation of the infinite, is not that we shall be skilled in the manipulation of Aristotelian logic but that we shall grasp in its ontological reality the act by which finite existents exist. And then we shall affirm God by recognizing Him".[1] It is to be noted that a writer so little disposed to the Catholic type of theology as H. D. Lewis should find Mascall's treatment of the problem "impressive".[2]

To my mind, however, it suffers from one serious defect. It sets out from a world of things rather than from persons; sufficient place is not given to man himself and to the moral experience that is peculiarly his. Where this further step is taken, there is a

1 *Op. cit.*, 78f.
2 *Morals and Revelation*, 179.

much closer approach to Kant. Thus the Italian philosopher Sciacca develops the Augustinian rather than the Aristotelian strain in Aquinas. His starting-point is not nature as a collection of objects, but the human situation, man in his finitude but with his awareness of spiritual values that lay claim to his allegiance. He has a need for God, and the task of philosophy is to show that this need is a rational one and that it is reasonable also to believe that a satisfaction awaits it in God. This being the case, it would be wrong to approach the inquiry in a detached attitude; the cogency of any demonstration that can be offered will depend to no small extent on the degree in which we feel that we are personally involved in our investigation. The greater part of the discussion that follows this statement of the initial standpoint is devoted to a demonstration of God from the life of the spirit, both intellectual and moral, the traditional ontological and cosmological arguments receiving only slight treatment thereafter.[3]

In his *Humanism and Deity* William Marshall Urban writes as a champion of the *philosophia perennis,* but his version of it is not substantially different from Sciacca's. He is fully aware that a demonstration of God's existence must be something quite different from demonstration in the natural sciences or even in a court of law: if we can be given certitude sufficient for the conduct of life, that is all we have a right to ask. He insists, too, that all discourse concerning God must take place "within a value-charged scheme of thought", that spiritual experience is not something to be brought in after God has been found from nature, but something without which He can never be found. "It is from nature only as including man and his values that any argument to God is possible".[4] In reading Urban one feels that the distinction between what he calls argument and Kant a moral postulate has worn very thin indeed; also, that he who finds God in nature as including man and his values and he who finds Him as uniting the worlds of nature and freedom are not far apart after all.

This fact, that the considerations urged by Kant against the traditional arguments are now actually being built into those arguments so as to renew their vitality, is further evidence that they possess—as Kant readily allowed—some value that makes it well-nigh unthinkable to discard them outright. What, for example, lies behind the tenacity with which so many simple folk cling to the inference from the world to a First Cause, so that the theologian who concedes the invalidity of this seems to them to have gone over to the enemy? In the first place, their life is governed by a deep personal conviction that craves to be articulated, and, since it is beyond their power to give it an original expression, they fall

[3] *L'Existence de Dieu.*
[4] *Op. cit.,* 213.

back upon the form made available in tradition. In the second place, they rightly feel that this same religious conviction, while transcending their own and the scientist's knowledge of the world, cannot be left unrelated to this: the traditional argument represents an effort to bring unity into our thinking, and they are aware of the necessity for this. My concern here is with the first of these considerations, with the traditional arguments as symbols of a non-rational conviction of a religious order.

The principle that all religious truth is symbolic, that religion can use language only by straining it, that overt meaning is a pointer to, a hint of, a mystery for which our common speech is inadequate—all this applies as much to an argument set out with all the impersonality of logic as it does to poem and parable. But there are various levels of symbolism. Thus, it would be possible with Erich Frank to show how the philosophical discussion of the arguments for God's existence from Anselm to the present day reflects the various stages through which European culture has passed, with its varying degrees of confidence in man's powers of reasoning.[5] Or, it might be urged, as has often been done, that the ontological argument symbolizes our conviction that what is highest in the order of value must also be ultimate in reality, and so on. I propose to penetrate to a yet deeper stratum and to maintain that each of the main arguments for God's existence can be read as symbolizing a personal attitude to God as He is met with in this world. God meets me in my present situation, and my personal responsibility and all my arguments about Him have force only as they admit of translation into these terms, an existential translation, if you will.

I begin with the ontological argument, and with that form of it which affirms simply that the non-existence of God is inconceivable, that once we understand what is meant by the word "God" we perceive that it is impossible that there should be nothing corresponding to it. Now of course there are persons to whom the non-existence of God does not in the least appear to be self-contradictory. They do not mean by God what Anselm did, and to that extent their denial does not invalidate his contention. But it is quite possible that their conception of God is nearer to the Christian one than his, at least in so far as he identified God with the *ens realissimum*. But the theoretical denial of God is not what interests us here, and it may be doubted whether a merely theoretical denial would ever constitute a serious challenge to faith. God is denied most seriously, not when some argument against Him has been constructed or when all arguments for Him have been refuted, but when the course of our experience seems to challenge Him. The really grave challenge to faith is that which

[5] *Philosophical Understanding and Religious Truth.*

springs from an acute realization of the suffering and injustice all around us.

Who among us has not had his moments when he felt with Ivan Karamazov, that if the universe requires the torture of one little child only, he would repudiate it and "hand back his ticket of admission"? The silence of God in face of man's inhumanity to man, not to mention those aspects of nature that we should brand as wasteful and cruel were men responsible for them, seems to argue that He may not be there at all. Indeed, would it not be better to believe in His non-existence than to regard Him as present but indifferent? The gods of Lucretius might be admirable objects of aesthetic contemplation, but to worship them would be out of the question. This denial of God is associated with sensitivity of conscience and humane feeling. The moral argument for God is as it were turned against Him and in extreme cases the repudiation of Him issues in a resolute will to set right what is wrong in the world, because only man is available to do this. That such an attitude tends to set up an intolerable strain and may induce self-righteousness and fanaticism is an important consideration, though it is not the one I am concerned with here.

Let me emphasize that the denial of God I have in mind is much more than any mere agnosticism or scepticism in face of ultimate questions. It is a repudiation of God that has behind it the whole self of the one who makes it and that commits him henceforth to a life determined thereby. Does not such a denial of God on the ground of the injustice and cruelty of the world-order spring from the recognition of an absolute good and allegiance to it? A man acknowledges certain claims of humanity and justice that take precedence of all others, for which he must endure spiritual isolation if need arise. But is not this absolute good precisely what the believer finds in God? Have we not here a denial of God that is based on an affirmation of Him? What conceals this from us at first is that God is denied as the Power behind the world because He is affirmed as the Love to which the heart pays homage. He is denied under one form only because He is affirmed under the other. We have thus an existential translation of the ontological argument: *God is He, the possibility of whose non-existence I simply cannot entertain, because my repudiation of Him as Power presupposes my recognition of Him as Goodness.*

As Karl Jaspers reminds us, this insight comes to magnificent expression in the story of Job and the Prometheus-legend. Their theme is the transition from defiance to devotion, or, as Whitehead puts it, from God the Enemy to God the Friend. Job arraigns God for His unjust treatment of one who has served Him faithfully, and he goes on to see in this but one instance of the moral confusion and want of justice characteristic of His rule. Yet, when he

appeals against God, to whom can he appeal? Only to God Himself. So he appeals from God as the Power that lays waste his life to God as the goodness and truth he has known so long. "Mine eye poureth out tears unto God; that He would maintain the right of a man with God." So Shelley's Prometheus, setting out from a different standpoint, embodies the protest of conscience against a Deity conceived of as mere power, as celestial tyranny. He is "the type of the highest perfection of moral and intellectual nature, impelled by the purest and the truest motives to the best and noblest ends." And the closing stanzas of the drama, with their evocation of patient suffering and triumphant Love, can be quoted by the devout Christian as an expression of what he finds in God. God has been affirmed in the very act of denying Him.

Secondly, we may take the argument from the contingent to the necessary. Everything that enters into our experience is finite. But the finite cannot be ultimate, it must imply the infinite. Contingent being has its ground in necessary Being. Descartes has developed this argument at greater length, taking an analysis of self-consciousness as his starting-point. My awareness of myself as finite would not be possible if I had access only to finite beings; it presupposes some awareness also of the infinite as the standard by which I judge myself and of which I know myself to fall short. We have here a pointer to the direction in which we must move if we seek, as we do, an existential significance in the argument. I mean that we must not remain content with the general assertion of the finitude of the self but must ask in what that finitude consists, how it is felt and lived with in the actual human situation. I know myself as dependent, and in my dependence I find God.

I am dependent in many ways, on nature, on others, and on mysterious forces over which I have no control. My whole conscious experience lies between two poles, birth and death. Only as a parent do I perceive what was hidden from me as a child, that I came into the world by no choice of my own but as one thrown wholly upon the mercy of others. We must be careful however how we state the implications of this condition of dependence with which we begin, for Freud has used it in the interests of his view that religious belief is illusion and immaturity. He would say that faith in God is persistence in the childish attitude, so that we linger in the early situation of dependence, with a more powerful being to provide for us, and do not grow up to take our life into our own hands. The Heavenly Father is an immortal substitute for the mortal earthly father. As such, He must be discarded if we are ever to achieve our own manhood. The presupposition of this whole contention is that dependence on God is incompatible with independence on our part. I would urge rather that the one is rooted in the other.

I recall in this connection a photograph that appeared in the press at the time of the Queen's return from East Africa after her father's death. It showed her, a subdued figure in deep black, descending the gangway alone from her aircraft, while at its foot, and in deep black also, stood the leaders of the three political parties. One called so suddenly to a position of supreme responsibility is in danger of being overwhelmed by a sense of his own inadequacy. Who can live through such a moment without a heartfelt appeal to a power beyond the human? What resolve can he make except to do what is in his power and to leave the issue with God? The words written by William the Silent to his wife are typical: "I have resolved to place myself in the hands of the Almighty, that He may guide me whither it is His good pleasure that I should go."

If we analyse such a situation as has just been described, we find, on the one hand, that only by the acceptance of one's situation as from God and under Him is one able to deal with it adequately, and, on the other hand, that only as one faces one's responsibilities with courage does one win the assurance that one is not alone. There is thus a close interconnection between our independence and our dependence. When we venture, at the call of duty, to take our life into our own hands, just then, paradoxically enough, there comes to us the conviction that we are in the hands of God. And again, it is when we are sustained by the conviction that God upholds us that we become capable of independent decision. In other words—and this is the existentialist translation we are seeking—*God is He, dependence upon whom is the ground of my own independence.* That is the meaning of the command to Gideon: "Go in this thy might . . . have not I sent thee?" To be sent by God is to have might of one's own. "This I know: in my freedom I am not through myself, but am given to myself. . . . Where I am authentically myself, I am certain that I am not through myself."[6]

I come next to the cosmological argument, by which we propose to pass from the causal series of events in the world to the First Cause. It is agreed that the First Cause thus arrived at is not the first in a chronological sense. The movement to it is not to be backwards in time but as it were downwards from stratum to stratum of our present experience: God is the ultimate ground of what happens within the world at any given moment, we might say. But, as I have urged throughout, any living and personal concern with God and His reality demands to be expressed in terms, not of the world and the objects in it, but of my actual situation as a person bound to other persons by relations of mutual responsibility. *God is He with whom I have ultimately to do in*

[6] Karl Jaspers: *Way to Wisdom*, 45.

my present situation, and to whom in the last resort I am responsible in it, however trivial that situation may appear to be. The final significance of the 'here and now' is that I am before God.

What this means may be stated, first in general terms, and then by the analysis of a typical situation. We may follow Marcel and ask what is meant by the question: "What shall I do with my life?" Let me suppose that I have picked up a pound note in the gutter and ask myself what I am to do with it. If by that I mean: Should I save it or spend it? and, in the latter case, on this or that pleasure or necessity? my question is not of the same order as if I mean: Have I the right to keep this or ought I not to report it to the police? In the second case, the question is a serious one as it is not in the first instance. Now the question: "What shall I do with my life?" is clearly a serious one, it implies that a responsibility is laid upon me, that right and wrong choices are before me, and so on. But would that be so had life come to me by an accident merely, as though I picked up the pound note and knew that it did not belong to anybody at all? Surely not. Any reflection upon life as the sphere of responsibility implies that in some sense it has been given to me. It is a trust from God: I have been given to myself.

Let me now take a simple situation from everyday life. I call at the grocer's shop to buy the family rations for the week. Even on such an occasion as this, numerous possibilities present themselves to me. I can be content with my fair share of what is available or I can make an effort to get more than I am entitled to. I can help to disseminate a spirit of dissatisfaction among those who are in the shop with me or to promote a cheerful acceptance of slight discomforts. If I see at a glance that the girl waiting on me is tired I can make the effort to be more patient and considerate than usual, or can dismiss her trouble as no concern of mine. That is to say, the situation has a moral significance, providing opportunity for helpful or injurious relations to other persons, for the acceptance or refusal of responsibility for what belongs to the common life. Because it is of such a nature, it is ultimately a dealing with God Himself, an opportunity for meeting Him that may be accepted or refused. God, that is to say, is not the First Cause of the world, He is the ultimate reference in my present situation.

So we come finally to the famous argument from design, one that suffered much from the challenge of the evolutionary theory last century, yet still reasserts itself from time to time. As an argument, it has against it Hume's contention that, however strong the case for some form of intelligence in nature, it is not clear that that intelligence is more good than evil, and that the religious spirit must always be concerned with the character of the God it worships. The real strength of the argument lies still in the common-sense consideration that, eventually, the only alternative

explanation to purpose is chance, and that this is far harder to accept. I see no means of showing that, to account for *Hamlet,* there really is an open choice between the existence of a genius and a mere haphazard collocation of the letters of the alphabet! But if we are to treat this argument as symbolizing a personal attitude to life, we must go deeper than that. The urgent question is not: Is there a purpose behind the world? but: Is there a purpose behind the present confusion and stress of my life?

Once the problem is stated in this way, we see that, to a large extent, design is not something to be found in our life but rather something to be introduced into it. When His disciples asked why the man born blind had suffered so, Jesus directed their thoughts to what might be made of his affliction by ending it. So in His healings He did not show the interest we do in a possible divine intention behind a sickness; He saw the will of God in His own effort to cure the sick person. We must look to the future rather than to the past for indications of purpose. We must also remember that, to put it paradoxically, God's purpose may be to leave some situations purposeless, so that we ourselves may introduce His purpose into them. We must not think of God as providing His workmen only with finished articles; He also sets before them the raw material, leaving it to them to make something of value out of it. In fact, it is a matter of experience that the discernment that the hand of God is at work in our lives is strictly proportioned to our own readiness to bring our circumstances into subjection to His will. It is in the course of working to His design that evidence comes to us that the Designer Himself was at work before us.

"God co-operates for good in all things with those who love Him, who are the called according to His purpose." However harsh and intractable the material may be with which life presents me, as I seek to give it a shape that is in accordance with the will of God, I perceive with awe that I am not alone at my task, that, far from imposing a project of my own upon it, I am but following invisible lines He himself printed upon it from the first. At last, in some high moment when He has brought me through to achievement, I look back and say to myself that I was meant for this. So Jesus said, at the moment when He confronted the Cross: "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world." His assurance of the Father's will in the sharpest trials of His life came to Him in the effort to subdue those trials to the purposes of His mission. So Joseph, looking back on all that he had suffered, could say to his brothers that God meant it for good, however evil their own purpose was. So the existentialist version of the argument from design will run: *God is He who enters every situation as a possibility of good and who calls me to co-operate with Him in the realization of this possibility.*

CONGREGATIONALISM IN SCOTLAND

By A. Morton Price, B.D., Ph.D.

Recent articles in the *Congregational Quarterly* have shown the diversity which exists among churches and unions called Congregational. It is good that we should realize this diversity, and in view of the forthcoming International Congregational Council it is desirable that the various strands of Congregationalism should be individually described so that we may appreciate the pattern of the whole. Congregationalism in Scotland is very different in its history and largely in its practice, from the English variety, a difference which often puzzles, and not infrequently horrifies, ministers who come north of the Border. In large part that is due to historical origins, but a factor of almost equal importance has been the nature of the Church of Scotland. That the Church of Scotland could and did speak for the people in the politico-religious struggle of the seventeenth century meant that a strong bond of respect and affection was forged between Church and people. Both had suffered alike in the common cause. Furthermore, the Presbyterian system seemed to suit the needs and temperament of the Scottish people, and the various splits within the Church in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries[1] tended to be Presbyterian rather than Independent. At no time has Scotland been a fruitful soil for non-Presbyterian Churches.[2] To this may be added, as of considerable significance, the high standards, educationally, spiritually and socially, of the ministry of the State church; parishioners could look up to their ministers as men, and respect them for themselves, and not for any sort of quasi-magical sanctity of their office. Right down to this day the Church of Scotland has probably as well educated and equipped a ministry as any denomination in the world. It was from such a background that the Scottish Congregational churches grew, and against which they stand today. In this situation their peculiar witness is perhaps less obvious, some would say less necessary, than it is in other regions. The problem this sets may be seen by contrasting the historical origins of Congre-

1 Reformed Presbyterian Church 1690. Associate Presbytery (Secession) 1733. The Synod of Relief 1761. The Free Church (Disruption) 1843.

2 John Highet (*The Churches in Scotland Today* (1950), p. 75) has compiled these statistics referring to the year 1947: Out of a population of some five million the six Presbyterian denominations claimed 1,296,231 members (1,256,167 in the Church of Scotland), all other Protestant denominations together 190,777, and Roman Catholics 472,600. Of the non-Presbyterian Protestant denominations the largest is the Scottish Episcopal Church (55,270), and then the Congregational Union (35,140).

gationalism in Scotland with the modern situation *vis-à-vis* the Church of Scotland.

Leaving aside a few abortive experiments in Independency[3], Congregationalism in Scotland did not arise until the closing years of the eighteenth century, and appeared then as a particular example of the missionary zeal which had prompted the foundation of the Baptist and London Missionary Societies. This movement in the north is generally connected with the names of Robert and James Haldane, the former of whom had offered himself to the L.M.S., but was refused admittance to India, so his missionary zeal had to find a local outlet. While they did a great deal from 1796 onwards to form churches, the Haldanes and their friends are to be seen not as unique religious leaders, but as prominent symptoms of an evangelistic spirit which was moving throughout the land. The State church was in the grip of "moderatism", and had a hearty distrust and dislike for the "enthusiasm" of the "missionaries".[4] This was shared by the other Presbyterian denominations, the Secession and Relief Churches. Hence those who were deeply concerned for the spiritual state of Scotland were compelled, much against their will, to separate themselves from the Church of their fathers[5] to form new groups who would be free to preach the Gospel and worship in such manner as they felt they should. At the beginning, and for a considerable period thereafter, the theory of Congregationalism was secondary to the practical demands of effective evangelism. In modern times that reason for separate existence is no longer valid. So far from the Church of Scotland being indifferent or opposed to evangelism, it is the leader in the work. It has pioneered various new methods of approach, like industrial chaplaincies, and from its large resources is doing much to spread the Gospel throughout the land.

The second root of Scottish Congregationalism is theological, and springs from the Secession Church. In 1843 Rev. James Morison was expelled from that body for preaching the "Three Universalities"[6] in contradiction of the Westminster Confession's doctrine of election. He and his followers formed an association for Bible study which they termed the Evangelical Union, and it

3 E.g. that of Alexander Jaffray at Aberdeen 1652, the Glasites (1730) and the Old Scots Independents (1768). For these *vide* James Ross: *A History of Congregational Independency in Scotland* (1900). *chs.* II-IV.

4 The forerunners of Perth Congregational Church were known locally from about 1794 (i.e. before the Haldane movement began) as the "Independent Missionaries" from their most obvious interest.

5 The Haldanes and their followers, particularly Revs. William Innes and Greville Ewing, seem almost without exception to have been members of the Church of Scotland.

6 The universal grace of God; universal salvation in Christ; the universal operation of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts. cf. John Murphy: "Two Notable Scottish Centenaries", *Congregational Quarterly*, April 1943.

rapidly became another denomination whose basic principle was the acceptance of Morison's teaching. The churches so formed were independent in their external relationships, but took over the Presbyterian system of internal government from the Secession Church, having two classes of office-bearers, elders to deal with matters spiritual (church membership and discipline), and managers to look after the temporal affairs of the congregation. As chairman of the managers and of all meetings of the congregation, a president was elected. The minister was not a member of the court of managers, although sometimes he was permitted to attend in an advisory capacity. Church meetings as understood in Congregationalism were unknown, the congregation normally meeting four times a year, sometimes less frequently, to transact business and hear reports.

At the time of its formation the Evangelical Union was opposed by the Congregational churches, who still held to the Calvanist position, and any churches which did adopt the 'new views' dissociated themselves from the Congregational Union and joined the Evangelical Union; but with the passing of the years Morison's "Universalities" gained acceptance in many churches, Congregational and Presbyterian, so that towards the end of the nineteenth century it was felt that there was no longer sufficient ground for the separate existence of the two denominations. After prolonged negotiations the two bodies united as the Congregational Union of Scotland as from 1st January, 1897. Morison's protest against rigid Calvanism had been so effective that in half a century his views were tacitly accepted, if not openly avowed, by a majority of churches in Scotland. That is the position today. While the Church of Scotland still maintains the Westminster Confession as its "subordinate standard of faith and doctrine", various Declaratory Acts have been passed which in effect give complete freedom of conscience in the interpretation of the Confession. This may seem to many an equivocal position in asserting a standard which need not be accepted; in effect there is complete freedom of thought and teaching within the Church of Scotland,[7] so that Congregationalism has no longer to assert liberty of belief and conscience against the State church, however doubtful it may be on the intellectual integrity of the present position in regard to the Confession.

[7] This does not hold in some of the minor Presbyterian bodies; the Free Presbyterian Church, for example, came out of the Free Church in 1893 because of disagreement on the passing of the Declaratory Act, declaring in its Deed of Separation: "By passing the Declaratory Act of 1892 the present subsisting Church, calling herself the Free Church of Scotland, through her General Assemblies has, in so far as the said Church is concerned, destroyed the integrity of the Confession of Faith as understood and accepted by the Disruption Fathers and their predecessors". (Quoted by Highet: *op. cit.* p. 20.)

This contrast of past and present in the two foundation movements of the denomination shows the present dilemma of Scottish Congregationalism. How far has it a separate witness to maintain in the ecclesiastical position today? The question of State connection is no longer vital, for in fact the Crown and its representatives have no authority within the Church, and the Lord High Commissioner is not a necessary feature of the General Assembly. On the question of income from teinds there may be argument, but a case can be made out that such revenue is of exactly the same nature as revenue from gifts and legacies which all churches are only too glad to collect. There are no direct subventions from the State. Argument at this point is liable to become academic on the nature of voluntaryism in the church, *viz.* how far any church which derives income from investments is tied to the social system which guarantees and provides that income, and is in that degree less than free.

There remains that which is regarded as the core of Congregationalism, the fellowship of the gathered church. It cannot be said that in Scotland the sense of that fellowship is very strong, particularly in the larger churches. For one thing there are so few opportunities of seeing it in action. How far the strong and lively E.U. element in the Union has been responsible for this it would be hard to say, but church meetings, even in churches which were not originally E.U., tend to be infrequent, quarterly, half-yearly, even only annually, and to be concerned with the appointment of officials and the transaction of business rather than in waiting upon the leading of the Holy Spirit. Much must also be attributed to the pervasive Presbyterian atmosphere, which encourages members to believe—in spite of all that they may be taught in membership classes—that deacons or elders are perfectly competent to guide the life of the church and take its day to day decisions with only an occasional report to the fellowship which elects them. That such a practice has in fact generally worked well is a commendation of our office-bearers, but a discouragement to the general membership to take a more active part in the life of their churches. The church meeting does not seem necessary.

Another factor working in the same direction is that so many of our members have been brought up in Presbyterian churches. That is particularly so in churches built in new housing schemes, where people naturally tend to attach themselves to the nearest church without bothering much about its denominational label; but it is also true, to perhaps a lesser degree, in the older-established churches. In the last seven years, for example, the Perth Church has admitted 116 members by certificate from other churches. Of these 26 came from Congregational Churches, 88 from Presby-

terian Churches (80 Church of Scotland, eight others), and 2 from other denominations. They changed their allegiance for various reasons, some because they married into the congregation, some because it was the nearest church, some because they liked the atmosphere or the minister, few because they were convinced Congregationalists. It is a good thing that men and women brought up in a different tradition should feel at home in our churches, but it has its dangers, too, in encouraging the carrying over of a non-Congregagtional attitude and habit into a Congregational Church.

Such general lack of appreciation of the essentials of Congregationalism raises difficulties in many directions. As has already been indicated it tends to make the office-bearers the real rulers of the church, and it also leads to a lack of responsibility in other directions, as in financial responsibility to the local church, in interest in the denomination, and in the support of missions. In particular there is less emphasis on spiritual experience as the path to membership, with the result that the Scottish churches tend to have a large proportion of Laodicean members on their rolls, and they are a difficult problem to deal with just by reason of their half and half position. Such may amount to one-third or one-half of the total membership,[8] and they are surprised, and pained, if it is brought home to them that church membership means more than occasional attendance at worship and spasmodic contributions to church funds. Even among those who have been brought up as Congregationalists it is amazing to find how many think it simply means Independency, particularly with regard to external denominational control, and have but the vaguest conception of what the gathered church is supposed to stand for in the Church at large.

While it has, for obvious reasons, been necessary to emphasize the points of difficulty and peculiarity in the modern Scottish Congregational scene, it would be untrue to leave the impression of a denomination lifeless and hopeless. The continued drift of population from the rural areas, both in the Highlands and in the Borders, has caused decline in some of the smaller and more isolated churches;[9] shortage of manpower for the ministry places

[8] This is not universally true. In north-east Scotland particularly, in the fishing towns of the Moray Firth, there is a greater hesitancy about "joining the church" so that the congregation may be much larger than the membership at every service except Communion.

[9] In the last thirty years the Congregational Union of Scotland has lost twenty-two churches, i.e., churches which have entirely ceased to exist, leaving out of account several which have entered into union with other churches. Fifteen of these were situated outside the four large cities (Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dundee) in the smaller towns and villages. In the same period seven churches have entered the Union, mainly as a result of church extension, and of these four are in the City of Glasgow, and three in Edinburgh. The result is a continuing concentration of the Union's strength in the Forth-Clyde area, in which, of course, it follows the trend of population.

many congregations in a difficult position, but throughout the Union as a whole there is a hopeful spirit, and an urge to apply the faith to the needs of the times. Since the Reconstruction and New Life project was launched in 1944 there has been an extensive revision of Union machinery to adapt it to current conditions; the two phases of the Forward Movement (the Movement as a whole was interrupted and divided by the L.M.S. New Advance Appeal 1948-1950) have seen a growth in youth work, an increase in the minimum ministerial stipend, the formation of two new churches, with plans afoot for others, a fresh Statement of Belief, and a growing awareness of the need for evangelism and a greater participation in campaigns of various sorts, denominational and inter-denominational.

To sum up, the position of Congregationalism in Scotland is that its adherents are not faced with the choice of "taking episcopacy into their system"; under present conditions that is a wholly unreal choice; much more pressing is the chance, or danger, of the absorption of "our system" into Presbyterianism, which, be it said, would make little obvious difference to the majority of our church members. The reasons for that have been set out above; why it has not happened, and at the moment is not really likely to happen, is the existence in the churches of a loyalty to the local fellowship which trends in the Church of Scotland make clear would be disregarded in any union. It may often appear that the local loyalty is not very deep, nor very effective in its practical working, but it does exist, and while it exists the Congregational churches in Scotland will continue, for, albeit unconsciously, in such a loyalty the root-principle of Congregationalism is being served.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea, a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

The Claim of Morality. By N. H. G. Robinson. 333 pp. Victor Gollancz. 21s.

Dr. Robinson defines ethics as the attempt to discover a principle of unity in our moral judgments, the attempt being made without leaving the sphere of morality or raising metaphysical questions such as that of the freedom of the will. The problem of ethics is produced by the conflict of moral judgments. This problem ethical theory seeks to solve.

The work falls into two parts: (1) historical, and (2) constructive. The historical part contains a very closely reasoned and detailed critical survey of ethical theories, beginning with Hobbes and the different answers to him in the eighteenth century, and continuing through Utilitarianism and Idealism to the New Intuitionism of the twentieth century, which is illustrated from Professor Prichard, Mr. Carritt, and Sir David Ross.

In the second part the results of the great critical survey are tabulated as follows:—

(1) The idea of right is simple and indefinable; it is the idea of a peculiar relation between agent, act and situation.

(2) Acts, though related to a series in time, are supratemporal like judgments: they have no temporal extension. They have two distinguishable but inseparable aspects, motive and intuition. The same intention goes with the same motive. But they need not be accompanied by the same series of objective events.

(3) The acts in question take place in a social structure, where their situation is subjective, being the objective situation as seen by the agent when he thinks sincerely about it.

But what is it that makes acts right or wrong? There are three main answers given to the question:

(1) The ground of rightness is in the consequences of the act. (2) It is in the motive. (3) It is in the act itself.

As to (1), an act cannot be judged morally by its consequences, since these can never be either foreseen or controlled. Therefore Utilitarianism, which makes the criterion of rightness the greatest happiness of the greatest number, must be rejected.

As to (2), though motive and intention are inseparable in the act, it is at the intention and not the motive that we look, when we judge it morally.

We are therefore reduced to (3), the view that what makes an act

right is in the act itself. It is in fact its intention. The moral consciousness judges it right because of its intention: it is implied that everyone will judge the same act right in the same situation. But here we come upon the conflict of moral judgments from which we began. In moral experience in fact we find conflicting duties. It is the business of ethics to find the principle on which the moral consciousness decides between them.

One act is better than another in a certain situation and therefore is right. But why is it better? It cannot be more right or less right. There cannot be degrees of rightness. Duty is formally the same over the whole field of conduct. We have therefore to examine the material side of the situation. The moral consciousness decides that an act is right because its intention is good. The good, then, is the aim of the right action.

Dr. Robinson says that there is a wide consensus of opinion to the effect that the only unconditional good is some form of spiritual activity or life, which is all-embracing and is a form of personal relationships. So far he goes with the Idealists. But he makes room for the new Intuitionism, whose principle is the absoluteness of right, when he further says that the spiritual life which is the all-embracing good makes a moral claim upon us. To realize this good is the intention which makes an act right; subordinate intentions appear as rules of the spiritual life in which the good consists. But the ideal is only vaguely before us; neither it nor the method of testing our duty by it in a particular case can be described in detail.

Not only Dr. Robinson's industry, but also his power of analysis and critical acumen are beyond praise. He has written a *vade mecum* of ethical theory. But what his book really shows is the extreme difficulty of the ethical problem. In the end after all the discussion, Dr. Robinson really leaves us simply to moral insight in the particular case which really concerns us. Still the discussion is worthwhile. It does at least show that there is no short and easy method in ethics. Anyone who fancies that there is will be quickly disillusioned if he studies "The Claim of Morality".

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

A History of Philosophy. By FRANK THILLY, revised by LEDGER WOOD. 658 pp. Allen and Unwin. 40s.

This very comprehensive one-volume history of philosophy, from its Greek origins to the present time, can be warmly recommended to students of the subject who need to orientate themselves historically in preparation for the study of the great philosophical masterpieces.

The original merits of Thilly's work of 1914 were in the objectivity and impartiality of the treatment, the proportion displayed in the presentation of the different thinkers, and the clarity and simplicity of the style. Notice was taken of the social, political and cultural factors that influenced individual philosophers; but at the same time the inner logic of the whole historical development was recognized, so that the later systems appeared as providing the necessary criticism of earlier schools.

The book has been brought up to date by Professor Ledger Wood, considerable new material being added, especially in the introductory and transitional sections. He has also brought the work down to our own day by giving an account of such movements as German Phenomenology and Existentialism, and British and American Neo-Realism, where Alexander, Whitehead and Russell are included.

The volume is beautifully produced and is pleasurable to read. It has a full index. For so large a volume it is very reasonably priced under modern conditions.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Christ and Culture. By H. Richard Niebuhr. 156 pp. Faber and Faber. 21s.

Professor Richard Niebuhr is to be contrasted with his tempestuous and prophetic brother, Professor Reinhold Niebuhr, for he writes with restraint and precision, though, I should judge, he did not correct the proofs of this English edition of his book. This is a work of learning, of philosophic insight and of religion. The writer's analysis and discussion of the differing attitudes to culture taken by divers Christians may be summed in their varying views of history. "For the exclusive Christian, history is the story of a rising church or Christian culture and a dying pagan civilization; for the cultural Christian, it is the spirit's encounter with nature; for the synthesist, it is a period of preparation under law, reason, gospel and church for an ultimate communion of the soul with God; for the dualist, history is the time of struggle between faith and unbelief, a period between the giving of the promise of life and its fulfilment. For the conversionist, history is the story of God's mighty deeds and of man's responses to them"; the "conversionist" holds the view, in fact, that "to God all things are possible in a history that is fundamentally not a course of merely human events but always a dramatic interaction between God and men". Tolstoy, Abelard, Ritschl, Aquinas, Luther, Augustine and F. D. Maurice are amongst those taken to represent various points of view, all (except, I think, Abelard) being treated with learning and insight. The author's chapter "Toward a Definition of Christ" and his treatment of "the Conversion Motif in the Fourth Gospel" are interesting and important. Altogether this is a book of uncommon and enduring quality.

N. Micklem.

Christianity Past and Present. Basil Willey. 149 pp. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

These lectures are as much a joy to read as anything written by Q's successor at Cambridge ought to be; but it is difficult indeed to find the right adjective to appraise them. Candid, learned, brilliant, penetrating, cautious, relevant—all these are 'strong candidates'; and the very variety of them is sufficient token of this book's interest and value. Added to all that, here is a layman writing theology; and if Professor Willey protests that he writes as a mere amateur, few professionals would cheerfully vie with him in insight, learning, or lucidity.

The question to which Professor Willey addresses himself is this: what does it now mean to be a Christian? What is the real foundation of Christianity? Has the Church decided that the foundation is different from what it was supposed to be in former times? If certain positions, formerly thought absolutely vital, have been abandoned, is Christianity now a mere bridgehead to be held against impossible odds? Or has it some power wherewith it can launch a counter-attack against the rulers of this world's darkness?

The treatment of this theme is generally historical: and there are many delightful and memorable *obiter dicta* while the journey through the history of Christian thought is rapidly made. There is, for instance, a brilliant appraisal and rejection of humanism, all the more telling for being completely understanding and just. In the brief compass of this review there is no space to comment on the narrative in detail or, more fascinating still, to discuss the final chapter. Suffice it to say that this provocative book will refresh the mind of every reader; it will stimulate much thought; and it will compel a fresh understanding of the foundation on which our faith is built.

John Huxtable.

The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation. By LE ROY EDWIN FROOM. In three volumes, totalling 2,671 pp. Review and Herald, Washington D.C., U.S.A. $5.00 each volume.

This massive work has been produced under the auspices of the General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists, Washington, U.S.A. That fact may arouse prejudice in certain minds. But prejudice is a poor substitute for informed judgment, and this work is entitled to the latter. It has been produced by a team of collaborators, headed by Professor Froom, whose resources have been measured in thousands of dollars and whose diligence has been tireless. No attempt is made to disguise the standpoint of the author and his colleagues: they are fundamentalists and adventists. But they have undertaken this work with responsible objectivity, and they have produced what is virtually a historical encyclopaedia of the interpretation of prophecy. It must be emphasized that it is a work of real scholarship. A careful analysis is given of the views on prophecy held by all church leaders of note from the first to the nineteenth century. The general trends are analysed, there are numerous charts and illustrations, copious indexes, and bibliographies running to over 100 pages. We could not find in comparable compass such reliable and annotated analyses of the views on prophecy of men of whom the following are but examples: Irenaeus, Augustine, Ambrose, Abelard, Chrysostom, Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Alcazar, Wesley, Whitefield.

As we approach modern times the work naturally becomes more tendentious. Some of us may doubt whether anxious preoccupation with the problems of prophetic interpretation should be so near the centre of our Christian concern; but these volumes remind us that we have tended to take from the ancient writers what we wanted and to commend what we approved, ignoring their views on questions we wished to shelve. Even if we do not follow this work to its conclusion, we must admire its careful scholarship and value it as a source of prophetic interpretation which is not likely to be superseded in this generation A. R. VINE.

Isaiah 40-55. By C. R. NORTH. 150 pp. S.C.M. Press (The Torch Bible Commentaries). 8s. 6d.

The Servant of the Lord and other Essays on the Old Testament. 327 pp. By H. H. ROWLEY. Lutterworth Press. 25s.

The Dead Sea Scrolls. By A. DUPONT-SOMMER. 100 pp. Translated by E. M. ROWLEY. Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

Professor North's commentary on Isaiah 40-55 is a useful addition to the Torch series, and particularly welcome because commentaries on such important Old Testament chapters are not easy to find. It is good too that the commentary is limited to this one section, agreed generally to be a unity apart perhaps from some few small amplifications, for these are chapters of great beauty and at the same time of first importance both in Old and New Testament thought.

The introduction is short, but deals with the background sufficiently for the purpose of such a work as this. Of particular value are the sections on the Fulfilment and Interpretation of the Prophecy, relating the New Testament interpretations of such prophetic material to the tasks of exegesis in the present time. The link between Biblical exegesis and Christian hymnody is one which, mentioned here with particular reference to Watts and Wesley, finds a number of apt illustrations in the course of the notes, and the reader will be able with value to add to these. As Professor North

says: "He will then discover how O.T. themes and language have been wrought into the texture of Christian devotion" (p. 29).

The notes deal with the text of the chapters in short sections, with many apt cross-references and suggestions of more satisfactory translations. (Many of the latter would not have been necessary had the R.V. been used as the basis of the commentary instead of the A.V., which presumably the editors of the series prescribe). Inevitably the notes are brief, within the compass allowed to the commentator, but there is much that will be helpful to the general reader and will guide him in his study of these chapters. It would have been helpful if the note on p. 117 on the sufferings of the Servant and of Jesus could have been elaborated, and similarly the section on Exodus and myth, religion and history (p. 121). Perhaps the long quotation of Blake's poem (p. 42) could have been spared and the space more profitably used. An occasional dogmatic statement raises questions, as the translation on p. 72 "gives or will give" for the perfect form of the Hebrew verb, which may or may not be justified. There is a curious sentence too at the bottom of p. 62 which needs clarifying.

Professor Rowley's collection of essays begins with two sections devoted to the most crucial problem of Deutero-Isaiah, namely the Servant of the Lord, a subject to which Professor North devotes some space, and on which he has written at much greater length in his book "The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah" (Oxford, 1948). Professor Rowley's short studies on this and on other subjects are of special value because of their critical appraisal of a wide variety of opinions. These chapters on the Servant indicate the richness of O.T. scholarship on this subject in recent years. The chapter on Prophecy covers a wide range of problems in brief compass. Of particular interest to the general reader will be the last chapter on Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age, in which chronological evidence and illustrative material from such excavations as those of Nuzi are carefully surveyed. Professor Rowley writes a convincing defence of the "critical" chronology of Nehemiah and Ezra, in which Ezra is placed some years after Nehemiah. In a chapter on Daniel, he argues for the unity of the book against attempts which have been made to dissect it into sections and remove many glosses. The whole collection of studies provides a brief introduction to some vital Old Testament problems and it is convenient to have articles published in various journals gathered together and thus made readily available.

Professor Rowley himself provides in a footnote (p. 83) a critical comment on the historical theory propounded by Professor Dupont-Sommer's book on the Dead Sea Scrolls (here smoothly and competently translated by his daughter). The idea that the sect to which the scrolls belonged claimed a martyred messiah in the time of Pompey and that even some O.T. passages were composed with reference to this individual (including the Servant Songs of Deutro-Isaiah) is fraught with improbabilities. Indeed the whole historical background discovered by Professor Dupont-Sommer is based on extremely tenuous evidence and has already been much criticized. Too much of the discussion of the Scrolls is made to serve this theory. But this must not obscure the fact that a considerable amount of the material of the Scrolls is here made available in translation, and this will be of value to the ordinary reader. The material can be allowed to speak for itself. A complete survey was, however, still impossible when Professor Dupont-Sommer wrote his book, as the whole of the material of the Manual of Discipline had not then been published, and the work is therefore in need of amplification to cover more recent publications.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. By H. P. V. Nunn. 152 pp. Eton: Alden & Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

The writer's main object is to set forth in full the external evidence, which occupies two-thirds of his book. He makes no apology for reopening a question which is commonly regarded as settled and so is often passed over in silence. His conclusion is that the tradition of apostolic authorship, which is widely denied, is in fact right. John the apostle wrote at Ephesus, where he lived until the time of Trajan, as Irenaeus states, and the whole idea of two Johns arose from Eusebius' misinterpretation of the famous and admittedly somewhat obscure remarks of Papias.

The remainder of the book turns to the internal evidence. Here Mr. Nunn finds nothing in the differences between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptists which would make it impossible for the former to be the work of the apostle. He quite rightly regards Dean Malden's epigram, "All external evidence is in favour of the son of Zebedee: all internal evidence is against him", as an exaggeration and an over-simplification. Yet the truth is that the case for the traditional view, which seems so convincing from the external evidence and from Mr. Nunn's examination of it, does appear very much weaker when we come to the Gospel itself.

Mr. Nunn would doubtless be the last person to claim to have spoken the final word on the subject. But he is to be congratulated on a book which is by no means superfluous, and to be thanked for the reminder that questions of authorship are not always to be confined to the lecture-room. Here, more than anywhere else in the New Testament, the problem of authorship (whether direct or indirect) is of supreme importance.

John Who Saw (Faber, 10s. 6d.) by Mr. A. H. N. Green-Armytage is described as "a layman's essay on the authorship of the fourth Gospel". Although unduly harsh towards the experts, as laymen can be, the author has written a sound and very absorbing book, and obviously knows what he is talking about. He comes down heavily on the side of the traditional view that John the apostle wrote all the Johannine books. He appends useful biographical notes on some of the scholars whose works he uses.

In *The Fourth Gospel and Its Message for To-day* (Lutterworth Press, 15s.), Dr. W. H. Rigg seeks to do justice to a topic which he feels has been rather neglected. The Gospel was produced as "a tract for the times" when the transference of Christianity from Palestinian to Greek soil challenged the church to adapt itself to new conditions. Today also the church is faced with a new situation and new dangers. Archdeacon Rigg is strongly of the opinion that the author was an eyewitness among the inner circle of disciples and that, if he was, his testimony and his interpretation of what he saw gain immeasurably in value. The great themes of the Gospel—the Glory of God, Eternal Life, Sin and Atonement, Faith, Church and Sacraments—are worthily expounded.

The Rev. A. W. Argyle in *The Christ of the New Testament* (Carey Kingsgate Press, 10s. 6d.) reviews the beliefs of the early church about the divinity of Jesus Christ, and discusses the "divine significance" of His death, resurrection, and exaltation. The writer adopts a conservative position, and accepts the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. He rightly believes that "the soteriological aspect of the Ascended and Exalted Christ as Mediator, High Priest and heavenly Intercessor, should also be a prominent feature of modern, as of Apostolic, preaching". "By His heavenly mediation and intercession, our reconciliation with God, effected by His Death, is sealed and ratified and made perpetual".

The controversial nature of the subject does not justify the author's unqualified assertion that Christmas Day was first observed in Rome on

25th December in the year 360. There is evidence for a date as early as 336. But the main criticism I would make concerns not the matter, which is sound without adding anything new, but the presentation. It is always helpful to the reader to quote biblical passages to which reference is being made. But Mr. Argyle does this so extensively that many pages are little more than strings of quotations, many of them unnecessarily long for his purpose, with the result that the thread of his argument is in danger of being lost. He is also fond of giving snippets of the Greek in footnotes, but in the great majority of cases to little or no purpose. These faults mar an otherwise good book.

The Body. By JOHN A. T. ROBINSON. 95 pp. S.C.M. Press. 7s.

This is No. 5 in the series *Studies in Biblical Theology*. The author writes out of the conviction that the Pauline concept of the body is of great importance for the understanding of the contemporary problem of the relation between the individual and society, and for its Christian solution, which is not escape from solidarity, but membership of the new solidarity which is the Body of Christ.

This concept of the body "forms the keystone of Paul's theology". "It is from the body of sin and death that we are delivered; it is through the body of Christ on the Cross that we are saved; it is into His body the Church that we are incorporated; it is by His body in the Eucharist that this Community is sustained; it is in our body that its new life has to be manifested; it is to a resurrection of this body to the likeness of His glorious body that we are destined". Moreover, this idea of the body is one of the most *distinctive* elements in Paul's teaching.

The book is divided into three chapters. In the first, "The Body of the Flesh", Dr. Robinson discusses the relationship between "flesh" and "body". While the former is the key to Paul's anthropology, the latter is the link between that and his gospel.

In the second chapter, "The Body of the Cross", he turns to the incarnation as the self-identification of Christ the Son of God with the body of the flesh in its fallen state. "The Christian, because he is in the Church and united with Him in the sacraments, is part of Christ's body so literally that all that happened in and through that body in the flesh can be repeated in and through him now".

The last chapter, "The Body of the Resurrection", considers the believer's participation in the resurrection body of the Lord. Here again, referring especially to Romans 7^4 ("ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ, that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead"), Dr. Robinson brings out the two-fold meaning of the Body. While, however, he rightly holds that the description of the church as the Body of Christ is much more than a metaphor, it *is* possible "to exaggerate the materialism and crudity of Paul's doctrine of the Church as literally now the resurrection *body* of Christ". I feel that Dr. Robinson is not entirely free from this tendency, and from other exaggerations such as the following: "The appearance on which Paul's whole faith and apostleship was founded was the revelation of the resurrection body of Christ, not as an individual, but as the Christian Community". I hope it is not unfair to suggest that what seems to me over-emphasis in this direction is due to thinking in terms of identity rather than of equation; nevertheless, this is a scholarly monograph, which provides much food for thought and deserves careful attention.

Biblical and Theological Studies (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, $4.50) is another massive volume (the third)

of the collected writings of the late Dr. B. B. Warfield, for many years Professor of Systematic Theology at Princeton Theological Seminary. Among the topics are "The Biblical Doctrine of the Trinity", "Predestination", and "Mysticism and Christianity". There is a long "biographical theological sketch" of the author, a man of great learning who devoted much of his energies to the furtherance of the belief in the plenary inspiration of the Bible.

A. J. B. Higgins.

The Christian Sacrifice: the Holy Communion in the Life of the Church. By W. N. Pittenger. 205 pp. Oxford University Press. 21s.

This is a learned and pious work. The author's purpose is to indicate the ways in which the Communion Service can be shown to be the Christian Sacrifice. Its presupposition is "that the Church, as Christ's mystical Body, continues in this world of space and time the presence and reality of incarnate and atoning Deity". The Church is to be not metaphorically but metaphysically understood as the Body of Christ, and Christ is supposed to be present "in a particular mode in the eucharistic species". We are not to be surprised if the Communion Service has come to mean more than was understood by the first Christians or even, it would seem, than was in the mind of Christ on the night on which He was betrayed. I conceive that this work is a further Anglican contribution to heresy, for the Church, to use convenient scholastic terms, is *relatio,* not *ens subsistens,* and this one false doctrine is the mother of many others. None the less the sympathetic study of this book might lead Free Churchmen to a deeper understanding of that central rite which Dr. Pittenger and his friends celebrate in ways so strange to us.

N. Micklem.

The Lord's Supper in the New Testament. By A. J. B. Higgins. 96 pp. S.C.M. 7s.

Many learned monographs and articles have in recent years been written upon the Lord's Supper in the New Testament; they are not all available in English and constitute almost a library by themselves. Dr. Higgins, therefore, has done great service in his brief but comprehensive survey of this field, nor has he hesitated to express his own convictions. He will have performed another important service if he convince controversialists how few of our surmises are secure. Dr. Higgins is persuasive even where he is not quite convincing. I should like to ask many questions. For instance, he supposes that our Lord expected "soon" to return in glory, yet he wished an "annual" Passover in his memory. How then is "soon" to be understood? There are, I think, even greater difficulties in the views expressed by Dr. Higgins, but there will be general acknowledgment that this is a work of impressive scholarship and learning.

N. Micklem.

The Church in the Christian Roman Empire. Vol. II. By P. de Labriolle and J. R. Palanque. Tr. by E. C. Messenger. 318 pp. Burns Oates. 25s.

This is the sixth volume in the English translation of the *Histoire générale de l'Eglise* now being produced by French Catholic scholars under the editorship of MM. Fliche and Martin. It is perhaps a pity that the titles and volumes of the translation have not been kept the same as those of the original. We have had four volumes entitled *The History of the Primitive Church* and two entitled *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire,* of which the work now being considered is the second.

This volume covers the fourth century, and is consequently to a great extent concerned with monachism. Well-documented detail is given, and

the work of Anthony, Pachomius and Basil is carefully described. Follies and excesses are not glossed over, and the degree of historical objectivity is high. This subject occupies nearly a third of the book. The next main section deals with relics, asceticism, liturgy, Christian literature and art. The third section comprises a very valuable survey of the geographical distribution of Christianity in the fourth century, both within and beyond the Roman Empire. This section summarises a vast amount of material for those who wish for a conspectus, and gives source-references for those who seek further detail.

The work is by Roman Catholics, and it would not be reasonable to expect them to look at things otherwise than from their own point of view. Nevertheless, the work shows a very high level of honest scholarship and a sincere desire to be complete and fair. This is well illustrated in the treatment of relics, Priscillianism and Donatism. Dr. Messenger has done the work of translation accurately and carefully. Proof correction has been well done, and I only note that "ever" on page 583, line 23, should surely be "however", and that there are some slips in Greek, for example the omission of an iota subscript on page 429, line 3, and a few erroneous accents. A. R. VINE.

The English Free Churches. By HORTON DAVIES. 208 pp. O.U.P. (Home University Library). 6s.

This is a very excellent introduction to Free Church history. In the space allowed by the series the work could hardly have been done better. The style is good, the balance is just, there is plenty of fact without descent to mere cataloguing. The story is traced from the times of Elizabeth I to the present day, and the numerous strands are firmly held and skilfully woven. Those who know something of their own denominational history will do well to set it into the broader background provided by this book, while any in doubt as to why they are Free Churchmen will find here a basis for factual reasons. Dr. Horton Davies, who is at present Professor of Divinity in Rhodes University, has done a piece of work which places us deeply in his debt. I have found no misprints or errors, but I deprecate untranslated Latin in a popular book. There are examples on pages 27 and 200. An English translation should be put in the text and the original, if necessary, in a footnote. There is a full index and a good bibliography. A. R. VINE.

The Journal of George Fox. A revised edition by John L. Nickalls. With an Epilogue by Henry J. Cadbury and an Introduction by Geoffrey F. Nuttall. 789 pp. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

The Birthplace of Quakerism: a handbook for the 1652 *country.* By Elfrida Vipont Foulds. 47 pp. 3s. *The Background of Quakerism in Wales and the Border.* By Evelyn Southall Whiting, Ronald Morris and John R. Hughes. 47 pp. 2s. 9d. *Friends in Oxford: the history of a Quaker Meeting.* By Stephen Allott. 23 pp. 1s. All obtainable from Friends Book Centre, Friends House, N.W.1.

Unbroken Community. The Story of the Friends' School, Saffron Walden, 1702-1952. By David W. Bolam. 184 pp. 10s. 6d. and 7s. 6d. Obtainable from the School.

Quaker Relief: an account of the relief work of the Society of Friends, 1940-1948. By Roger C. Wilson. 373 pp. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

The Quaker Bedside Book. Compiled, arranged and introduced by Bernard Canter. 253 pp. Hulton Press. 12s. 6d.

The Society of Friends does not usually look with favour on the observance of days and years. It has, however, so far relaxed its rule

as to greet with these and other publications its entry upon a fourth century. The summer of 1652, in which, after a vision of a great people to be gathered, George Fox found in North-West England groups of Seekers and others who responded to his call, may fairly be regarded as marking the Society's foundation. If at times Fox has received an exaggerated reverence from those within the Society, he has received less than his due of attention from those without; and it may be hoped that the new edition of his *Journal* will be read both widely and with reflection. Indefatigable and indomitable, penetrating of eye and pungent of speech, devastatingly honest, showing courage in continual persecution combined with forbearance towards his persecutors, Fox belongs to us all, at least to those of us who are Free Churchmen, no less than does Cromwell or Baxter or Bunyan. "The Lord's power was over all": this was his faith, and the phrase echoes through the pages of his *Journal*. Few Christians will not take heart if they will read, in a style which, at once strong and sweet, unselfconsciously reflects the man, how again and again, as Fox walked cheerfully over the world, answering that of God in every man and trampling and thundering down deceit, he proved that faith to be true. The *Journal* has been in print, somewhat bowdlerized, since 1694; the original MS. was published *verbatim et literatim* in 1911; the present edition is the first in which Fox's own words (with some conflation from other sources) are made available in a form attractive to the ordinary reader.

I know few parts of the country more appealing in their combination of strength and beauty with tradition and a sense of the past than the fells and valleys, the moorlands and isolated farmsteads, in North-West England where Fox found his first following. It is a countryside which asks to be written about as well as visited. *The Birthplace of Quakerism,* nevertheless, is an achievement. Within 40 pages Mrs. Foulds has packed an astonishing amount of information about the old meeting-houses and halls and how to find them, as well as sketches of those "First Publishers of Truth" who were no sooner "convinced" than they carried the message far and wide. Those were great days of new-found joy and liberty: "the Kingdom of Heaven", wrote one, "did gather us, and catch us all, as in a net".

Within a couple of years Friends from the North were bearing witness in Wales, for instance, and to Oxford University. In Wales and the Border Country, after an initial efflorescence, in ground prepared, Mrs. Whiting and her colleagues suggest, by earlier Lollard activity, Quakerism declined, largely through mass emigration to Pennsylvania. At Oxford likewise, after heroic if extravagant beginnings, there was no regular meeting for worship for a century and a half. But it was an Oxford tradesman who, in a sermon from "This is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith", made a Quaker of William Penn; and the city where later Penn addressed the Vice-Chancellor as a "poor mushroom" has this summer welcomed Quakers to meet in conference from all over the world.

Though opposed to an academic training for their ministry, Friends have always been concerned for secular education, and Mr. Bolam's book admirably reflects the Society's continuing faith and life. The co-educational school now at Saffron Walden, providing grammar school education for 200 boarders and 100 day scholars, independent but in close relations with the Essex Education Committee, was founded in Clerkenwell in 1702 under the inspiration of John Bellers as "an adventure in compassion" for poor Quaker children and old people. Throughout its many changes it has remained a family, and a family which "must be good": it has retained "all the soundness, kindness, security of a school guided by men who brought insight learnt in business, personal friendliness and their Quaker

faith to the task''. The unrivalled source-material available might have made for dullness, but this is a fascinating story, written gracefully and with perception, with an eye to Locke, Charity Schools, Hannah More, Arnold and the world outside, but excelling in its presentation of the School's own community life.

In this century it is probably for their relief work that Friends are best known. Here, in another way, they still show the faith that overcomes, sure that the Lord is over all. In *Quaker Relief* Professor Wilson has written a modest and careful account of the work. After surveying evacuation hostels and welfare schemes at home, he turns to the overseas work in France, Holland, Germany, Austria, Poland, Greece and elsewhere. He confines himself largely to a factual record and to straightforward narrative; for a consideration of the principles underlying the constitutional structure of the work, in which, as General Secretary of Friends Relief Service during the war, he was specially concerned, Professor Wilson directs the reader to his 1949 Swarthmore Lecture, *Authority, Leadership and Concern*. Requiring the capacity ''to live adaptably and imaginatively in unforeseen circumstances'', Quaker Relief, he writes, was ''the expression of a sense of values through personal relationships in physical situations which were more demoralizing than physically disastrous'': ''we came to have a wonderful sense of common responsibility before God''.

Those who have time for no more than a posy of Quaker flowers plucked and arranged with love and skill cannot do better than turn to the attractive *Bedside Book* of Quaker principles, practices and personalities compiled by the Editor of *The Friend*. The personalities chosen are Fox, Penn, Woolman and Elizabeth Fry, of whom Baron de Bunsen said that ''of sin'' she ''seemed to take no cognisance, except in compassion''. Much of the Society's glory lies in that, and also something of its limitations.

All these books save Fox's *Journal* are well illustrated.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The following three books are about men who were, in many ways, as different as they could be both in thought and in temperament; and yet they share some striking similarities, for they were all men whose work aroused either enthusiastic praise or violent opposition, they all grew to exert a nation-wide influence, and they have all suffered from relative neglect by historians and theologians in this country.

The Rev. John T. Wilkinson, of Hartley Victoria College, in *William Clowes* (Epworth Press, 6s.) has written a detailed and informative account of the life and work of the man who began as a potter, but who became, with Hugh Bourne, the founder of the Primitive Methodist Connexion. Reading through this little volume one could not help comparing William Clowes and his colleagues with John and Charles Wesley, who had pioneered the way less than a century before. Despite the differences of temperament and upbringing there was the same evangelical fervour, and the same concern for the souls of men, and it was ironical that the Societies which the Wesleys had founded should expel Bourne and Clowes in a manner hardly less gracious than the treatment meted out to the Wesleys and Whitefield by the Church of England. The sufferings of these early Primitive Methodists for the cause of the Gospel ought to be acknowledged by the Methodist Church, and indeed by the whole Church of Christ, with pride and respect: if ever men were in the true apostolic succession, these deserve to be numbered among them.

Mr. Wilkinson's book is a scholarly piece of work, as we should expect, but the only question that remains in my mind after reading it is whether the lovable personality that Clowes shows himself to have been never had

any place for humour: if he had, then it is a grave omission in the book.

In *Torchbearer of Freedom* (University of Kentucky Press, Lexington, U.S.A., $3.75), Dr. Carl B. Cone has written a study of 'the Good Dr. Price', the eighteenth century Unitarian minister who divided England into two hostile camps by his writings in favour of the American War of Independence and the French Revolution. One may wonder with the author of this book why this extremely attractive and versatile figure has not received more attention from English writers. Dr. Price was not only a preacher and a distinguished writer on moral philosophy, but he was also a mathematical member of the Royal Society, an authority on Life Insurance and Public Finance, and the friend of many of the great and the near-great—all this, and at the same time he was one of the most controversial of writers on political theory of the eighteenth century. Yet one feels that despite all his erudition and preoccupation in public affairs, Dr. Price was a good man and one that we can believe in—personally retiring and modest in the midst of public controversy, and likeable even when we disagree with him.

The chapters on Richard Price's influence during the American War, and his friendship with men like Benjamin Franklin and Colonel Barré, naturally receive a good deal of attention from the American author, and they are of particular interest to English Free Churchmen for two reasons; first, they illustrate the fact that the older English Dissent "had always had its political side", and secondly they show the very active interest which English Dissenters of that period took in the struggle of their co-religionists in America. It is at least possible that civil dissabilities against Dissenters in this country would have been lifted fifty years before they were, had not the government of the day been frightened into repressive measures by the very forthright (and sometimes unwise) public declarations of Dissenters during that revolutionary period.

This is a well-written book, and the writer seems, in the main, to be well-informed on English history; but I hardly think it is correct to refer (on p. 7) to the ecclesiastical settlement of the Protectorate as 'the Anglican Church'.

Grundtvig: An Introduction (London, S.P.C.K., 21s.) by Professor P. G. Lindhardt of the University of Aarhus, is an introduction to the nineteenth-century Danish poet, theologian and social reformer, Nicolai Frederick Severin Grundtvig.

At first sight it might be thought that there would be little in this book to arouse anything more than a very limited interest in this country; the work of Grundtvig is unknown, and his only appreciable influence on England was in a distinctly specialist field—in stimulating research in the Anglo-Saxon origins of our language, notably *Beowulf*.

Dr. Lindhardt shows, however, that there are good reasons why English people ought to know as much about Grundtvig as his great contemporary Soren Kierkegaard. In the first place Grundtvig visited England four times and was a keen but admiring critic of this country. At the beginning he was very attracted by the doctrinal emphases of the Tractarians, Pusey and Newman, but his criticisms of the theory of Apostolic Succession get right to the heart of the Reformation protest against a hierarchical conception of the Church, and he very accurately prophesied that Newman's theories would lead him to Rome. Grundtvig was greatly influenced by his experiences in this country, and carried something of that English influence back to Denmark within the spheres of social and ecclesiastical reform. It was largely as a result of his English experiences that he pressed for the relaxation of religious uniformity in Denmark.

Altogether there is a good deal more of interest to the English reader in this book than its title and subject suggest. The one fundamental criticism of it is its price: 136 pages of reading matter for twenty-one shillings would be a crippling price for a work of more popular appeal, but for this book it may well be fatal. ROBERT S. PAUL.

Ecumenical Foundations: a History of the International Missionary Council and its Nineteenth Century Background. By WILLIAM RICHEY HOGG. 466 pp. Harper and Brothers, New York. $5.00.

Envoys of Peace. The Bible Society's Popular Report for 1951. Ed. J. E. FENN. 105 pp. B. & F. B. S. 1s.

These works are all related to the subject of religious co-operation. Richey Hogg's detailed and fully documented account of the formation and development of the International Missionary Council shows clearly the impetus to interdenominational co-operation which has come from the churches' endeavour to fulfil their world mission. This, as the title of his book suggests, was the earliest and is still the most potent factor in the ecumenical movement. One of the most valuable aspects of this book is the way in which it shows how the principles which have come to guide ecumenical action were hammered out in the early days of the International Missionary Council, as it began to translate a desire for co-operation from the realm of discussion into the realm of common action. It is illuminating, too, to note the interaction between co-operation on a national scale with co-operation on a world scale. Dr. Hogg's method is to take the main stages in the story of the I.M.C. (up to Edinburgh 1910, from Edinburgh to the foundation of the I.M.C. in 1921, from Jerusalem 1928 to the outbreak of the second world war, and the war years) and to describe for each stage the development of organization, the activities undertaken, and the personalities involved. The method involves some repetition, and some of the mass of detail here assembled might have been omitted without impairing the value of the book as a standard work of reference on the subject which it will undoubtedly become; a comprehensive bibliography and index add to its usefulness. But it brings out clearly both the complexities which must be handled by an instrument of Christian co-operation which is both interdenominational and international, and the extent of what has been achieved with extraordinarily small resources. The book, which was prepared as a doctoral thesis and is not an official history, brings together into an orderly and intelligible narrative a great deal of material not accessible elsewhere, much of which is all too little known even amongst those regularly involved in the ecumenical and the missionary aspects of the life of the Church. Since advance in both those spheres depends to a very great extent on a much more widespread awareness and deeper understanding of the nature, activities and significance of the International Missionary Council and of the World Council of Churches in whose formation it was the principal element, it is to be hoped that this important book will be widely read. It is also to be hoped that it will be used for source material by those concerned with the significance of the Church in its world mission.

The British and Foreign Bible Society is one of the oldest instruments of missionary co-operation in Britain, one of the forerunners which made the I.M.C. possible. Its annual survey of its work throughout the world is a standing testimony to what can be accomplished through such co-operation: for example, the issue in the year under review of over seven million volumes of the Scriptures (Bibles, New Testaments or portions). Mr. Fenn's world survey describes how this task has been accomplished amidst

the upheavals of the contemporary world, and he tells the complex story with that vivid lucidity which we have come to expect in the Popular Report of the Bible Society. R. K. ORCHARD.

The Nature of The Church. Edited by R. N. FLEW. 347 pp. S.C.M. 21s.

This volume contains papers presented to the Theological Commission appointed by the Continuation Committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order. It is, in fact, another of those important volumes designed to help the churches to understand one another's point of view. The first part of the book deals with the churches of Great Britain and Europe, the second part with America. Many of the statements here printed have been officially endorsed by church authorities, and in all cases they are more than merely statements of private opinion. Such a volume cannot be reviewed in a short space. Congregationalists may be disposed to see first how they themselves appear. British Congregationalism is represented by the very useful documents gathered in the pamphlet styled "Congregationalism" and here reprinted. Professor W. M. Horton is responsible for the article on American Congregationalism. He points out, as Dr. Douglas Horton has also recently insisted, that the Leyden Separatist Pilgrim Fathers who landed at Plymouth in 1620 soon "made the acquaintance of the non-Separatist Puritans of Massachusetts Bay, who in a few years overwhelmingly outnumbered them. In fact, the Puritans who went to America were in the main 'non-separatist Congregationalists', members of the national Church who wished to reform it by substituting the Congregational for the episcopal order." This should shock and illuminate our more rigid Independents. Our theologians are likely to be equally shocked by some of the theological statements as that "the Church is the continuation of the Incarnation", which looks like (but doubtless is not) a piece of sheer Romanism. The statement of "the essential points in the message of the Church" would, I think, have horrified Forsyth. The Kingdom of God seems here to be identified with "the world as it would be if it were committed to the love of God", rather odd Biblical exegesis, and I read with surprise that in America in the sphere of worship practice "has tended to move in the 'Catholic' (liturgical) direction". We may learn, therefore, about ourselves as well as about other people. N. MICKLEM.

Intercommunion (World Conference of Faith and Order). Ed. DONALD BAILLIE and JOHN MARSH. 406 pp. S.C.M. 21s.

This substantial volume of over 400 pages, prepared for the Conference at Lund this year, is a learned, diversified, and convincing exposition of the existing deadlock between the Churches arising from questions of order. There are three main positions on 'Intercommunion': Communion in the sole rightful Church (held by the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches, though with differences); Inter-communion between differing communions which acknowledge the validity of one another's faith and order (notably held by the Church of England); and open Communion, the welcome of all Christians at the Lord's Table (held, among others, by the English Free Churches). But there are many intermediate positions, and various complicating factors. The merit of the book is that it is not tendentious, but brings out remorselessly the complexity and divergence of convictions in the existing situation.

The book falls into three parts. Part I contains the report of the Commission, which is a lucid and balanced statement. (Unfortunately, the page references to the modifications desired by some members of the Commission do not correspond with the printed pages and can be determined only with unnecessary difficulty.)

Part II contains some historical studies of the problem of Intercommunion: in the Patristic Age, the Reformation, the 17th and 19th Centuries, and the Ecumenical Movement. These are very illuminating and by far the most valuable part of the book. To these must be added a remarkable essay by Professor Greenslade which brings out the difference between the attitudes of Cyprian and Augustine and those who today profess to rely on their authority; and an illuminating essay by Dr. Niesel which brings out the difficulty for Lutherans of intercommunion with any who do not hold the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist.

Part III contains a variety of individual comments on the question. These are nicely balanced to give the answers for and against almost every possible position. Perhaps the Methodists suffer most in being confined to one point of view. The Congregationalist contribution by Professor Marsh is right in raising the question of the meaning of Intercommunion at the level of the local Church, though there are differences about the nature of the local Church which may prevent his contentions being accepted.

The book ends with a useful appendix on the existing rules and customs of the Churches, and an account, without comment by the Commission, of an experiment in reviving the Agape.

The Roman Catholic contributor to the volume suggests (p. 146) that the inspiration of the Faith and Order Movement is Anglican; and there is much to bear this out. It should have become clear from such volumes as this that the Anglican as much as the Roman position demands capitulation to its own premisses. It is surely time that Free Churchmen had more confidence in their own churchmanship, not only in its own right, but as providing the only ground-principle for ecumenical fellowship.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

NEW EDITION

Contemporary Indian Philosophy. Edited by S. Radhakrishnan and J. H. Muirhead. 648 pp. Allen & Unwin. 35s.

The first edition of this book was published in 1936 and I reviewed it at some length in the *Congregational Quarterly,* speaking especially of Mahatma Gandhi's short but significant confession of faith, Rabindranath Tagore's attractive essay on *The Religion of an Arsist,* and Dr. Radhakrishnan's essay on *The Spirit of Man,* a brief but powerful statement of his Neo-Hinduism. The Dean of St. Paul's words "There is no modern philosophy, there are only modern philosophers" are as true of the East as of the West and the other eleven essays differed much in their teaching.

The second edition is nearly three hundred pages longer than the first and contains eleven new essays and thus provides a still more comprehensive picture of varying phases of modern India philosophies. In the first edition there was one omission: although Muslim philosophers were asked to contribute, none did so. In this edition, M.M. Sharif writes on *Dialectical Monadism.* This new edition thus provides a still fuller picture of the renaissance of thought in India whch is so notable a feature of our age.

Sydney Cave.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

Kings and Prophets of Israel. By ADAM C. WELCH. 264 pp. Lutterworth Press. 18s.

This work has been edited by Prof. Norman W. Porteous, successor to the late Prof. Welch in Edinburgh University and also a former student of his. The editorial work is limited to a brief preface, compression of style at certain passages, and a few judicious footnotes. There is, too, a memoir of Welch. This has been written by another former student, Dr. George S. Gunn. It is some thirty pages long and pays a gracious tribute to a great teacher.

The studies comprise two lectures on the two kings, Saul and David, and four lectures on the prophets, Moses, Amos, Hosea and Isaiah. They display that independence of thought and quickness of sympathy for which Welch was noted. Despite the fact that the lectures were delivered at intervals over a period of years, they do not give the impression of being "dated". (Welch died in 1943). Those who know his previous works on the Psalms and Jeremiah will be glad to have this new work. It is a book to be read with profit, and though there is not much that claims to be new, what is said is well said. JAMES WOOD.

Picture Map of the Holy Land. Designed by FRANCIS CHICHESTER, illustrated by Lawrence Stone. Publ. Francis Chichester, St. James's Place, London. 30 in. x 40 in., 6s. 6d. 14 in. x 19 in., 15s. per dozen. (Postage and packing, 1s. 6d. in each case.)

A little confusing at first sight, this map will be of great service in the hands of a good teacher. It shows every place in Palestine mentioned in the New Testament, the political divisions and the roads. On and around the map are little inset pictures illustrating the main events in the life of Jesus Christ. These little pictures are clearly and well done. It will soon be realized that picture and place do not coincide: place and picture must be separately indicated by teacher to class. The siting of uncertain places has been done with good judgment, and I would only question Emmaus. It is shown as generally accepted in the 4th century, but most modern experts regard 20 miles from Jerusalem as both textually and intrinsically unlikely. Intelligently used, this map will prove very valuable. The larger edition is suitable for wall or blackboard, while the smaller edition, which also contains text references, might be on the teacher's desk or in the hands of each scholar. A. R. VINE.

Prayers for the Christian Year (O.U.P., 9s. 6d.) is a revised and expanded edition of a book which first appeared in 1935. It is a typical Church of Scotland publication, thorough, theological, dignified, occasionally archaic in diction, abundantly satisfying to the Christian who knows his faith. Particular attention may be drawn to the Festival of Nine Lessons for Christmas, to the special services for Holy Week including a Meditation on the Seven Words, and also to a Service of Seven Lessons for Easter Evening. It is an excellent book and no minister should be without it.

In the first place *The Art and Craft of Laypreaching* by Dr. N. Micklem (Independent Press, 8d.) ought to be put into the hands of every minister. Not that it will teach him anything new: but it will remind him of things forgotten and it will refresh and comfort him in his preaching ministry.

Then, with a new vision of the unspeakable privilege that is his, he will find other hands into which to press this pamphlet. He will see that it reaches his laypreachers and all others who might become such. And good will come of that; for Dr. Micklem is a wise and experienced teacher, and never has he written more persuasively.

Is personal evangelism to be left to the crank? That is a crude but clear way of putting the challenge we must face. We are intolerant of the "Brother, are you saved?" approach; but what do we put in its place that is wiser and more effective? By shrugging away the bungler we do not dispose of the task. It still awaits us. C. T. Follett does us good service in making us face this in *When God Goes a-Fishing* (Independent Press, 4s.). He writes for committed Christians who love their Lord, to encourage them to bear Him personal witness. He testifies from his own experience to opportunities which can be found and taken—or missed. The subject all through is related to the Bible, and two excellent chapters on Bible-Study are not out of place.

Here is a pacifist pamphlet to be reckoned with, *Pacifism and Some Christian Centralities* by Norman Goodall (Independent Press, 7d.). The only advice that a reviewer can give is to buy it, read it and digest it. The pacifist will thereby be much strengthened and broadened in his faith; the non-pacifist will find he is at grips with more than constitutional debility or wilful individualism. To read this is to be searched by the Gospel, for this is pacifism based not on sudden expediency, the pacifism of panic, but pacifism based on the Christian centralities of (a) the transcendence of God, (b) the apostolic or truly missionary character of the Church, and (c) the spiritual nature of the Faith. Dr. Goodall's closing remarks about pacifism as a vocation may well be compared with those of Prof. W. R. Forrester on the same subject in *Christian Vocation* p. 67 ff. And one of the most thought-provoking of all Dr. Goodall's remarks is surely this: that Christian pacifism shows no sign of becoming a major theme in the life of the younger churches, not even in India or China.

World of Ideas and Illusions (Stockwell, 6s.) is by Dr. John Perfect, D.Met. (i.e., Doctor of Metaphysics) and has an introduction by George H. Brown, Mus. D. (Double), Ph.D., D.Psy., F.E.U., F.N.C., F.R.C., F.N.S. Need one say more?

A Sure Anchorage (Stockwell, 4s. 6d.), by Sydney J. Forster, is a collection of meditations on Christian themes. There is nothing very original in content or form, but some sane application of truth to the task of daily living.

A Chairman's address has both to be heard and to be read. Not every address can pass both tests. Some only sound splendid when delivered; others gain as they are quietly studied. Such, I imagine, is Leslie J. Tizard's *The Gospel and the Individual* (Independent Press, paper, 9d.). Mr. Tizard apologized for speaking primarily to ministers when laymen were present in large numbers. He need not have done so. If our ministers need to think again and again about their job, and they do, there is no subject on which our laymen need to think more honestly and deeply than on the place and work of a professional ministry in our Congregational Churchmanship. Whoever actually does the work so wisely surveyed by Mr. Tizard, the responsibility for seeing that it is done does not rest with one man alone. It is the Church's responsibility. The blame for a cramped ministry does not always rest with the minister, nor is the credit for a rich one his alone. Let this address come into the hands of all, so that our churches may both enjoy and exercise a yet more effective ministry. JOHN WILDING.

The Man in the Manse. By JOHN BISHOP. 156 pp. Epworth. 9s. 6d.

Here is yet another book on the work of the ministry. But it is by no

means a superfluity. Those who read Mr. Bishop's articles in the *Christian World* will be glad to have them in this permanent form, and those who did not do so now have opportunity to remedy their loss. Mr. Bishop deals with almost every aspect of a minister's life: his personal and family life, the preparation and delivery of sermons, visitation and dealing with people, the approach to children and young people, practical and financial matters. He has wise and helpful things to say under all these headings, and a young minister will be wise to study and act upon the counsel given. Older ministers will be encouraged and refreshed. It is good that books of this kind should appear every few years: there is always a rising generation; and those already in the ministry need periodical reminding that their difficulties are not unique, that others have faced and conquered them, and that there is no task more diversified and challenging than theirs.

I have no adverse comment to make upon this book. It is gracious and wise, helpful and encouraging. If I wanted anything added, it would be more direct warning about some of the special temptations and dangers which a minister may at some time have to face. There are better ways of learning about fire than for each of us to have to burn his own fingers.

A. R. Vine.

The Communication of the Gospel. By David H. C. Read. 96 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

This volume contains the *Warrack Lectures* for 1951. Most of Mr. Read's predecessors have confined themselves to the field of homiletics; but he has confronted a cognate and in some senses much more profound problem: how do you preach *today* so that people will understand what you mean? To attempt to answer such a question properly involves some discussion of the contemporary scene. This is well done; but it might be objected that Mr. Read takes too long doing it; if so, he may be forgiven, since he exhorts his hearers to remember that "our chief task as preachers is to be announcers of good news, not midwives of calamity". In general, Mr. Read believes that the unintelligibility of most preachers arises from two causes: (i) parsons see too much of parsons, not enough of ordinary people, and therefore do not know well enough how ordinary people think; (ii) too many preachers use too much jargon, usually without knowing it: all who utter in Church should read the chapter entitled "The Word and the Words". A moving plea is made that the minister and his people should display in their lives the Church's 'involvement' with the world: "for the living Word there is no by-pass road from study to pulpit"; "the road from study to pulpit runs through a living, demanding, interrupting manse . . . in and out of houses and hospitals, farms and factories . . . up between rows of puzzled people to the place where you are called to preach". It might, perhaps, be said that Mr. Read does not quite sufficiently address himself to the nadir of his problem: how do you preach to a generation which does not share your fundamental presuppositions? All that he says is good and true, and it is to be hoped that it will be given good heed; our sermons would be much improved if we reckoned with what he says; but no efforts after merely verbal intelligibility will bridge the gap between the Christian preacher and those who neither believe in God nor have any sense of right and wrong. This is an honest and practical book, illuminated by its author's vivid and unusual experience; it reminds the preacher of the greatness of his calling, and it helps him to be worthy of the vocation wherewith he has been called.

John Huxtable.

Worship.

The Church Meeting.

Congregationalism and the Ecumenical Movement.
Independent Press. 8d. each.

These three *Church and Kingdom* Pamphlets provide excellent material for instruction and discussion, and it is much to be hoped that every Congregationalist will read them. Each is addressed to a topic about which many of our people are in much need of help. Many are aware that our worship needs improvement; but they have little or no grasp of the principles on which our worship rests, and so cannot get on successfully with reformation. Many also are anxious to re-establish the Church Meeting to the place which we always tell members of other Christian Communions it occupies in our church-life; and a good many who rejoice in the closer fellowship of Christian Communions the world over would like some clear guidance as to the place Congregationalism has in the Ecumenical Fellowship. All such will find much food for thought in these first-class pamphlets, and will be grateful that the Life and Work Department had them prepared.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Organist and the Congregation. Ed. ERIK ROUTLEY. Independent Press. 2s.

This slim booklet consists of "Lectures and a Sermon delivered at the first Conference of Congregational Organists, held at Mansfield College, Oxford" in 1951. The chief contributors are Dr. Christopher of Carr's Lane, the Rev. Douglas Stewart of Chesterfield, Mr. J. P. B. Dobbs of Durham, and the Rev. Caryl Micklem of Oundle. I hope that all organists will read what is here reported; but not only organists: let ministers and deacons read it as well. This booklet will do much to make possible that co-operation of minister and organist which is so necessary to the proper conduct of public worship, that understanding of each other's point of view without which this co-operation is impossible, and that delineation of issues without which discussion is often vague and vain.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

Johann Sebastian Bach as a Biblical Interpreter. By WILLIAM H. SCHEIDE. 40 pp. Princeton Pamphlets No. 8, Princeton Theological Seminary, New Jersey. 75 cents.

This is the book, or at least a chapter of the book, for which the present reviewer has long been looking. It is the work of "a young Christian layman, who, besides being a distinguished musician, has made himself a leading authority on the music of Bach" (the quotation is from John A. Mackay's Foreword). The author seeks to show how Bach treats the text of the Bible, and his paper is arranged in the order of the Biblical books—O.T. (Cantatas), Gospels (Cantatas, Passions, Oratorios, and the Mass in B minor), and Epistles (more Cantatas). There is genuine profundity here without pretentiousness; and there is a sincere effort to relate music and piety which seems, on the first two readings, to be entirely innocent of sentimentality.

The Organ, Its Evolution, Principles of Construction, and Use. By W. L. SUMNER. 436 pp. Macdonald. 30s.

Thirty shillings and well worth it! This will certainly be one of the classics of this ancient and admirable craft. Here we are told everything that the subtitle claims, with, in addition, eighteen good illustrations and 57 organ specifications, from 1549 to the Royal Festival Hall. Required reading, and fascinating reading, for the organist and at least one other member of every church. Mr. Sumner is eminently sound on the technique of service-playing.

ERIK ROUTLEY.

MISCELLANEA

Understanding Europe, by Christopher Dawson (Sheed & Ward, 16s.), will be welcomed by those who are already familiar with Mr. Dawson's numerous writings on the relation between Christianity and culture. This theme has of late received considerable attention, by Mr. Dawson himself in his Gifford Lectures and by Dr. Emil Brunner in his, as well as by other writers. In *Understanding Europe* Mr. Dawson offers a historical diagnosis of our ills as well as his prescription for their cure; for in his customarily lucid manner he describes the various national and cultural traditions contributing to the present world-picture and to the understanding of the nature of Europe, which, he insists, is not a continent so much as a society of peoples held together, where it coheres at all, by a common Christian tradition. He hopes that the decline of Europe suggests by its very suddenness that it may be a temporary crisis rather than a final catastrophe, since the fall of earlier cultures has been preceded by a long process of decay. However that may be, the crisis in European culture is serious enough, but may be profitable if it makes the European peoples realize their common interests and the need to restore their broken unity. "It is only as part of a larger whole that the states of Western Europe can survive, whether they are great or small." This we are rapidly learning, though we have not fully realized the spiritual basis of such survival. Mr. Dawson is right, I think, in pointing out that one of the defects of the United Nations is that it finds no place in its organization for European society as such, which can easily be outvoted not only by the Eastern block plus one or two others but even by the Caribbean and Central American states alone. I do not know whether Mr. Dawson would agree with Mr. Algernon Cecil, who in the preface to his brilliant book on Metternich holds that the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was a disaster of the first importance for modern Europe; he does suggest, however, that Europe has lost by its breaking up into a multiplicity of independent political States.

For this condition of things Protestantism is partly to blame, through its separation of religion and culture. What is Mr. Dawson's solution? It will consist, as Miss Barbara Ward, the late Michael Roberts, and Mr. Herbert Agar, have insisted, on the recovery of the Christian values. The alternative to total secularization is the return to Christian culture, which must be achieved through Christian education. Even though he does not tell us how it is to be done, Mr. Dawson's prescription is doubtless right. This book is as free as the rest of his work from any kind of Catholic bias; in this he displays an admirable historical spirit. It is a pity that the price is so high for a book of 260 pages.

With Mr. Dawson's conclusion that "it is only by the rediscovery of the spiritual world and the restoration of man's spiritual capacities that it is possible to save humanity from destruction" Sir Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan would be in full agreement. There are indications of this in *Radhakrishnan, An Anthology,* edited by A. N. Marlow (147 pp., Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.), which makes available in small compass some of the thinking of the distinguished Indian philosopher whose greatness consists, partly, of the services which he has rendered in interpreting Eastern philosophy and religion to the West and in bringing his own deeply spiritual and idealistic thought to bear upon the philosophy of the West and the crisis of its culture. Although it is difficult to do justice in an anthology of less than 150 pages to the great bulk of his writing, I feel that there might have been more extracts from

The Idealist View of Life, Professor Radhakrishnan's Hibbert Lectures, which is in many ways a great book; but one cannot include everything.
GERAINT V. JONES.

Modern Poetry and the Christian Tradition. By AMOS N. WILDER. 287 pp. Charles Scribner's Sons (New York). 3 dollars.

It is an undeniable even if paradoxical fact that at a time when the churches have been losing ground literature, especially poetry, has been concerning itself more and more with religious themes. Professor Wilder examines this aspect of modern poetry, comparing and contrasting it with 'traditional' religious poetry, and relating it to general cultural trends. He considers not only the Roman Catholics (G. M. Hopkins) and the Anglicans (Messrs. Eliot and Auden), but also those poets in whom, as in Mr. Dylan Thomas, the religious consciousness is revealed indirectly in their attitude to nature. Of particular interest are the pages on contemporary American and French poets, whose work is likely to be less familiar to English readers.

Himself an experienced literary critic and a Congregationalist (he spent two years at Mansfield and three in a Congregational pastorate), Professor Wilder would seem to be the ideal exponent of his theme to readers of this journal. But there is one danger which he, in common with so many scholars and critics of literature today, by no means entirely avoids: that of forgetting that a poet writes poems to be enjoyed, and not in order that they may be compared with other poems. P. A. SPALDING.

The Tree of Life and other Verses. By NATHANIEL MICKLEM. 87 pp. O.U.P. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Micklem is a philosophical poet, and in this long meditation on "truth revealed and supernatural" he has attempted something that would test the greatest. Thought in poetry, at any rate in great poetry, is nearly always simple. Lucretius was a great poet in spite of his philosophy. Dr. Micklem's virtuosity is remarkable, but the effect of wedding Spenserian stanzas which lack Spenser's smoothness with nineteenth-century imagery and archaic diction is not always felicitous. Much more successful are the sonnets and, still more, the occasional lyrics which follow (such poems as "The Past" show this poet at his best); while those pieces written in the conviction that "it is man's duty to be serious but not pompous" are both clever and amusing. Whatever we may think of Dr. Micklem as a philosopher, as a poet we prefer him in lighter vein. P. A. SPALDING.

Control of Life. By HALLIDAY SUTHERLAND. 282 pp. Burns Oates. 15s.

This is a revised and enlarged edition of an earlier work. Dr. Sutherland is evidently alarmed by the falling birth rate and denounces contraceptive information. He makes scathing references to the "Trade Most Foul" engaged in producing artificial devices for preventing conception; he severely criticises "The Surrender at Lambeth" on the issues of contraception; and ridicules the attitude of the Humanists and Communists. His chapters on "Bread and Fertility" and "Milk and Sterility" are useful for the ordinary reader whose special knowledge here is perhaps limited. The author is a sincere Roman Catholic and, if one is prepared to grant his first premises, his concern for the falling birth rate can be fully appreciated. Nevertheless his fears of the white race diminishing and of "Losing an Empire" do not justify, to my mind, his diatribe against birth control. The dangers of contraception are known both to Roman Catholics and to Protestants, but the categorical statement that "all healthy married people should procreate" may equally be open to criticism. W. E. SARGENT.

INDEX

Vol. XXX. 1952

ARTICLES—

		PAGE
Allen, E. L.	The Arguments for God's Existence	346
Baxter, Richard	Advice to a Young Minister	231
Brown, Robert McAfee	The "Conversion" of P. T. Forsyth	236
Bunn, Leslie H.	*Congregational Praise* (1)	118
Chaning-Pearce, Melville	Simone Weil: A Study	202
Christopher, Cyril S.	*Congregational Praise* (2)	122
Davies, Horton	A Salute to the Memory of John Philip: 1775-1851	57
Ferré, Nels F. S.	The Party Line in Modern Theology	295
Groetsema, Frederick	The Congregational Churches and the Ecumenical Movement in America	41
Grubb, Kenneth G.	The Churches and International Relations	313
Guntrip, H. J. S.	Psycho-analysis as Exorcism	136
Hardyman, J. T.	The L.M.S. and the Congregational Witness in Madagascar	65
Hough, Lynn Harold	Culture and Politics	107
John, Glynmor	The People to whom we minister	148
Jones, Geraint V.	Conscience, Guilt and Expiation: Some notes on Dostoievsky	245
Kiek, Edward S.	The Religious Situation in Australia	52
Lewis, H. D.	Religion and Mystery	22
Marsh, John	Unions and Associations: Some historical Notes	321
Mathews, A. G.	From the Margins of a Psalter	113
Mayhew, Christopher	The Difficulty of Understanding the Russians	306
Micklem, Nathaniel	The Hope and Menace of Immortality	11
	The Pope's Men	218
Packard, A. Appleton	A Reformer of the Reformed	154
Phillips, James	Scrapbook for 1900	253
Price, A. Morton	Congregationalism in Scotland	354
Unwin, Sir Stanley	Edward Unwin: 1840-1933	32
	Elizabeth Unwin (*nee* Spicer)	127
Woodger, Phyllis L.	Bernard Lord Manning: a Memoir	336

BOOKS REVIEWED—

Allen, E. L., *The Purpose of Jesus*	76
Alney, H. (comp.) *Light in Darkness: a book of daily readings*	277
Anderson, M., *Noel Buxton: a Life*	278
Approach to Christian Unity	176
Argyle, A. W., *The Christ of the New Testament*	365
Armour, J., *The Story of Christianity*	274
Armytage, W. H. G., *A. J. Mundella*	187
Arundale, R. L., *Project Work in Religious Education*	184
Avery, M., *Teaching Scripture: a Book on Method*	184
Baillie, D. and Marsh, J. (ed.) *Intercommunion (World Conference of Faith and Order)*	373
Baillie, J., *Natural Science and the Spiritual Life*	87
Bailey, D. S., *The Mystery of Love and Marriage*	282
Bainton, R. H., *Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther*	173
B.B.C. Hymnbook	89
Bishop, J., *The Man in the Manse*	376
Blackham, H. J., *Six Existentialist Thinkers*	264
Bliss, K., *The Service and Status of Women in the Christian Churches*	280
Bouyer, L., *The Pascal Mystery*	276
Bolam, D. W., *Unbroken Community*	368
Bowle, J., *Hobbes and his Critics: a study in Seventeenth Century Constitutionalism*	174
Bowmer, J. C., *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in early Methodism*	82

Brandon, S. G. F., *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* . . 80
Brunner, E., *The Scandal of Christianity* 75
Butterfield, H., *Christianity in European History* 188
Caiger, S. L., *British Honduras* 189
Canter, B., *The Quaker Bedside Book* 368
Carlson, H. (see Peel)
Carter, H., *The Methodist Heritage* 83
Cheshire Agreed Syllabus 283
Chichester, F., *Picture Map of the Holy Land* 375
Child, R. L., *The Lord's Supper: a Baptist Statement* 89
Church Report of a Theological Commission on Faith and Order . . 175
Clarke, J. S., *Disabled Citizens* 188
Cone, C. B., *The Torch Bearers of Freedom* 371
Congregationalism: A Statement made to the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches 181
Cross, F. L., *St .Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures* 81
Davies, H., *Great South African Christians* 183
The English Free Churches 368
Davies, P., *Y Ddau Gleddyf* 277
Dawson, C., *Understanding Europe* 379
Dewar, L., *The Moral Conduct of the Christian* 181
Dodd, C. H., *Gospel and Law* 266
Driver, G. R., *The Hebrew Scrolls from the neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea* 170
Drummond, R. L., *Lest We Forget* 95
Duncan, R., *Selected Writings of Mahatma Gandhi* 94
Dupont-Somer, A., *The Dead Sea Scrolls* 363
Edwall, P. (and others), *Ways of Worship* 176
Edwards, R. A., *Church and Chapel* 273
Eichrodt, W., *Man in the Old Testament* 78
Elliott-Binns, L. E., *The Development of English Theology in the later Nineteenth Century* 272
Ellul, J., *The Presence of the Kingdom* 74
Farrer, A., *A Study in St. Mark* 79
Feibleman, J. K., *Philosophers lead Sheltered Lives* 286
Fenn, J. E. (ed.), *Envoys of Peace* 105
Ferguson, J. M. M., *Sing Praises: A Hundred Services for the Infant Assembly* 186
Flew, R. N. (ed.), *The Nature of the Church* 373
Forrester, W. R., *Christian Vocation* 280
Foster, J., *After the Apostles* 80
Fromm, E., *Psycho-analysis and Religion* 86
Froom, L. E., *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers: The Historical Development of Prophetic Interpretation* 363
Fry, C., *A Sleep of Prisoners* 91
Galloway, A. D., *The Cosmic Christ* 170
Geddes, Lord, *The Forging of a Family* 284
Gorodetzky, N., *St. Tikhon Zadonsky, Inspirer of Dostoievsky* . . . 175
Green, B., *The Practice of Evangelism* 88
Green-Armytage, A. H. N., *John who Saw* 365
Grieve, P., *The Wilderness Voyage* 284
Gruffydd, W. J., *Crist a'r Meddwl Modern* 177
Guntrip, H., *You and Your Nerves* 189
Hatfield, H., *Thomas Mann: an Introduction to his Fiction* 285
Heawood, G. L., *Vacant Possession: Thoughts on Religion, Personality and Education* 181
Henderson, G. D., *Church and Ministry* 177
Henriques, B. L. Q., *Club Leadership Today* 88
Higham, F., *Lancelot Andrewes* 269
Higgins, A. J. B., *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* . . . 367
Hobhouse, S., *Forty Years and an Epilogue* 191
Hodgson, L., *The Ecumenical Movement* 176
Hogg, W. R., *Ecumenical Foundations: a History of the International Missionary Council and its Nineteenth Century Background* 372
Horney, K., *Neurosis and Human Growth* 179
Howe, E. G., *A Psychologist at Work* 287
Huehns, G., *Antinominism in English History* 271
Hunt, B. P. W. S., *Primitive Gospel Sources* 171

Hunter, A. M., *Interpreting the New Testament, 1900-1950* . . . 172
Incledon, P., *The Cactus Hedge* 186
Jones, G. R., *The Religion Behind the Religions* 282
Kelber, M., *The Introspective Listener* 190
Kinlock, T. F., *The Life and Works of Joseph Hall, 1574-1656* . . 269
de Labriolle, P. and Palanque, J. R., *The Church in the Christian Roman Empire (Vol. II)* 367
Lake, G., *Our Lord: an Outline Life of Christ* 180
Lampe, G. W. H., *The Seal of the Spirit* 268
Langridge, D. W., *The Plain Man's Christ* 89
Leitzmann, H., *The Era of the Church Fathers* 267
Lindhart, P. G., *Grundtvig: an Introduction* 371
Mabele, N., *Popular Hymns and their Writers* 185
Macgregor, G., *Christian Doubt* 264
McKenzie, J. G., *Nervous Disorders and Religion* 85
McNeill, J. T., *A History of the Cure of Souls* 272
Mathews, B., *Disciples of all Nations: the Story of Christian Expansion* 278
Micklem, N., *The Tree of Life and other Verses* 380
Mitton, C. L., *The Epistle to the Ephesians* 265
Montgomery, J. A., *The Book of Kings* 265
Morris, R., *The Quality of Learning* 184
Morse-Boycott, D., *A Golden Legend of the Slums* 274
Muirhead, J. H. (see Radhakrishnan)
Nias, J. C. S., *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter* 271
Nickalls, J. L., *The Journal of George Fox (revised)* 368
Nicodemus, *The Kingdom of the Real* 182
Niebuhr, H. R., *Christ and Culture* 362
North, C. R., *Isaiah 40-55* 363
Nunn, H. P. V., *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel* 365
Nuttall, G. F., *Richard Baxter and Philip Doddridge* 173
The Reality of Heaven 274
Oldham, J. H., *Florence Allshorn* 183
Olney, H. (comp.), *Light in Darkness* 277
Oulton, J. E. L., *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit* 76
Owst, G. R., *The Destructiorium Viciorum of Alexander Carpenter* . . 269
Palanque, J. R. (see de Labriolle)
Parker, C., *A Book of Festival Services* 91
Payne, E. A., *The Free Churches and Episcopacy* 273
Peel, A., and Carlson, H., *Cartwrightiana* 73
Peers, E. A., *The Mystics of Spain* 269
Pewtress, S. L., *Saul who is also called Paul* 180
Pei, M., *The Story of Language* 285
Pike, R., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Religions* 274
Pilkington, R., *Biology, Man and God* 87
Pittenger, W. N., *The Principles and Practice of the Christian Faith* 275
The Christian Sacrifice: the Holy Communion in the Life of the Church 367
Powell, G., *Personal Peace and Power* 276
Quell, G., and Schrenk, G., *Bible Key Words:* (1) *Righteousness;* (2) *Sin* . 79
Quin, C., *The Ten Commandments: a Theological Exposition* 275
Radhakrishnan, S., and Muirhead, J. H. (ed.), *Contemporary Indian Philosophy (new edition)* 374
Raven, C. E., *Science and the Christian Man* 283
Rawlinson, A. E. J., *The Church of South India* 84
Read, D. H. C., *The Communication of the Gospel* 377
Rigg, W. H., *The Fourth Gospel and its Message for To-day* 365
Rilke, R. M., *The Life of the Virgin Mary* 180
Robertson, D. B., *The Religious Foundation of Leveller Democracy* . . 174
Robinson, J. A. T., *The Body* 366
Robinson, N. H. G., *The Claim of Morality* 360
Routley, E., *I'll Praise My Maker: Studies in Classical Hymnody* . . 185
(ed.) *The Organist and the Congregation* 378
Rowley, H. H., *The Old Testament and Modern Study* 77
The Servant of the Lord and other essays on the Old Testament 363
Submission in Suffering and other Essays on Eastern Thought 178
Russell, B., *New Hopes for a Changing world* 95
Sabine, W. H. W., *Second Sight in Daily Life* 188
Sandilands, A., *Negro Spirituals: One Hundred and Twenty Songs* . . 186

Scheide, W. H., *Johann Sebastian Bach as a Biblical Interpreter* . . 378
Schrenk, G. (see Quell)
Smith, A. R., *The Bible Doctrine of Man* 74
Snaith, N., *Hymns of the Temple* 78
Soothill, W. E., *The Hall of Light* 183
Spalding, P. A., *A Reader's Handbook to Proust* 286
Stevenson, W. B., *Critical Notes on the Hebrew Text of the poem of Job* 171
Stout, G. F., *God and Nature* 263
Sumner, W. L., *The Organ: its Evolution, Principles of Construction and Use* 378
Sutherland, H., *Control of Life* 380
Talon, H., *John Bunyan: the Man and His Works* 82
Thilly, F., *A History of Philosophy* 361
Todd, J. M., *Prayers and Services for Christian Festivals* . . 185
Urban, W. M., *Humanity and Deity* 169
Vaswani, T. L., *A Prophet of the People* 85
Gita: Meditations 85
Wand, J. W. C., *What St. Paul Said* 277
Warfield, B. B., *Biblical and Theological Studies* 366
Warren, M., *The Christian Mission* 183
Weatherhead, L. D., *Psychology, Religion and Healing* 85
Welch, A. C., *Kings and Prophets of Israel* 375
Wilde, R. W., *Psychology and Religious Faith* 283
Wilkinson, J. T., *William Clowes* 370
Willey, B., *Christianity Past and Present* 362
Williams, G. H., *The Norman Anonymous of* A.D. 1100 81
Wilder, A. N., *Modern Poetry and the Christian Tradition* . . . 380
Wilson, R. C., *Quaker Relief* 370
Witting, C. (ed.), *The Glory of the Sons: The Story of Eltham College* . . 278
Year Book of Education, 1951 (ed. Lauwerys, J. A., and Hans, N.) . 190

REVIEWERS—

Ackroyd, P. R., 170, 363
Blackman, E. C., 80, 182, 277
Bonifazi, C., 275, 276, 277
Cave, S., 178, 266, 374
Cunliffe-Jones, H., 74, 78, 79, 176, 181, 272, 373
Davies, Horton, 183
Davies, Pennar, 177
Franks, R. S., 169, 263, 360
Guntrip, H. J. S., 85, 86, 179
Higgins, A. J. B., 171, 172, 265, 365
Huxtable, J., 89, 91, 273, 362, 377, 378
Jones, G. V., 285, 379
Jones, I., 277
Lovell-Cocks, H. F., 74, 79, 170, 181, 264
Marsh, J., 75, 76, 286
Micklem, N., 76, 175, 176, 180, 185, 276, 362, 367, 373
Murray, A. V., 184, 185, 188, 190, 269, 283
Newport, J. E., 175
Nuttall, G. F., 81, 82, 174, 175, 269, 271, 368
Orchard, R. K., 84, 278, 372
Paul, R. S., 83, 370
Phillips, J. M., 7, 91, 104, 183, 191, 196, 200
Pyle, E. H., 87, 283
Robinson, W. G., 272, 275
Roper, F. M. H., 278
Routley, E., 89, 186, 190, 378
Sargent, W. E., 282, 287, 380
Spalding, P. A., 85, 191, 284, 380
Surman, C. E., 187
Tizard, L. J., 88, 188
Vine, A. R., 73, 80, 81, 82, 173, 180, 189, 267, 268, 273, 274, 285, 286, 363, 367, 375, 376
Wilding, J., 90, 177, 279, 375
Wood, J., 77, 78, 171, 265, 375
Wright, J. S., 186